

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

Minnesota



**PART C DUE
February 1, 2024**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) continues to be diligent in monitoring progress and determining opportunities for improved practices based on equity for each and every child and family in Minnesota and 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us through Part C services as led by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004, revised in 2011. This includes data collection and analysis systems; professional and leadership development; high-quality and equitable Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) and programming; family-and-caregiver-centered service delivery and assessment practices; and increased family and caregiver, stakeholder, and Tribal Nations engagement in each part of systems' change and development. The FFY 2022 Annual Performance Plan demonstrates that Minnesota is currently meeting Compliance and Performance Indicators 1, 2, 6, 3A1, and 8B. Minnesota does not meet criteria nor need to report for Indicators 9 and 10. Compliance and Performance Indicators 3A2, 3B1, 3B2, 3C1, 4B, 4C, 5, 7, and 11A were not met but did not have slippage. Compliance and Performance Indicators 3C2, 4A, 8A, 8C, and 11B were not met and had slippage. While the outcomes of each of the indicators that are not meeting the targets are disappointing, these measures and their indications of quality services and programming continue as a top priority as we work in new ways to ensure we are meeting the needs of each and every child and family as well as the workforce that support them.

Please note that Compliance Indicators 7, 8A, and 8C, and also Performance Indicators 3A2, 3B2, 3C1 and 3C2 were not met and had slippage in FFY 2021. These are addressed in the appropriate Indicator sections in response to OSEP comments.

Equitable access, process, and policy has remained a focus of Minnesota's early childhood programs for each and every child and their families and caregivers we serve. We recognize that partnerships and collaboration are key to supporting the whole child and family and caregiver system. We continue our partnerships with our parent information and training center, departments of health, commerce, corrections, and human services, as well as our leadership and practitioners of programs across the state. The Part C Coordinator meets on a regular basis with the lead of Minnesota's Special Education Advisory Panel (SEAP) to ensure alignment of information and work between the SEAP and the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Childhood Intervention (ICC). We also continue building partnerships with Native communities and individuals, diverse community organizations, university programs, and national partners. Within the department of education, the Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Team collaborates with division partners across MDE to support the requirements of monitoring and dispute resolution. This affords the ECSE Team the ability to support the field consistently in best practices and due process supports. In addition, oversight for Minnesota's Part C program is set to shift to a new, statutorily-named Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) on July 1, 2024. This agency will combine a large number of additional early childhood care and education programs from the current Minnesota Departments of Human Services, Health, Education, and Public Safety (<https://m.gov/mmb/dcyf-implementation/>). We have developed a Part C Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document to assist in supporting providers and families during the initial transition in lead agency (<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/PartCFAQ/>).

Continuing into FFY 2022, Federal Part C American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act funds enabled us to create stronger interagency collaborations, contract services to develop a training series that supports trauma healing and culturally supportive early intervention programs across the state, and complete four Family Engagement Grants focused on creating meaningful ways to engage families, caregivers, communities, and diverse stakeholders. These funds have also supported continued relationship-building through consultation and collaboration with the 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us for American Indian families and caregivers living on and off Tribal Nation lands, as supported by Minnesota codified law signed November 8, 2021. Additionally, 22 Part C programs across our state implemented grants to support disparities among children, families, and caregivers in our early intervention programs as magnified by the COVID-19 pandemic, the focus of which was determined through program and community engagement.

It is significant to note that Minnesota remains committed to ongoing monitoring and continuous improvement with a dedicated focus on ensuring equitable services and systems for each and every eligible infant and toddler and their families and caregivers. As a birth mandate state, ensuring a Free and Appropriate Public Education (FAPE) for infant and toddler services means Part C is an early entry point into an educational system which many communities experience through historical and current trauma and marginalization. The work continues. Please note that "caregiver" is used throughout Minnesota's SPP/APR and SSIP where there is flexibility to include additional people who surround infants and toddlers eligible for Part C services. This is intentional to honor the critical role that many caregivers play in a young child's life, which may include and is not limited to parents, grandparents, kinship, guardians, childcare and education providers. The use of "parent" is often still used, especially as it pertains to rights afforded via federal regulations that have defined parent specifically.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

As Minnesota continues recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic, we know the effects will be long-term on our youngest served and their families. Minnesota's FFY 2021 data continues to demonstrate an impact in FFY 2022 data in some interesting ways, including continued record numbers of referrals through both our online Help Me Grow Minnesota (HMG) (<https://www.helpmegrowmn.org/HMG/index.html>) and local program referral systems. The HMG referral system demonstrated an over 9% increase in referrals during FFY 2022. Of the 12 calendar months for SFY 2023, all but three months were the highest for each month respectively on record, with October marking a new all-time high online referral count in Minnesota for a single month at 2,688 referrals. Note this number does not include referrals made directly and locally to school and cooperative programs.

As a comparison, the difference in referrals in total from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022 was 2187 more students referred into our Help Me Grow referral system. Minnesota has seen this significant increase of referrals continue into FFY 2022, an 8% increase over the previous reporting period. As we review child count data, we saw a 1% increase in the number of Hispanic and White children receiving services in Part C Early Intervention and a .5% increase in Black children.

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part C requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

The Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) implements a comprehensive, multifaceted system of general supervision to ensure compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to improve services and outcomes for students with dis/abilities. MDE's system includes program and fiscal compliance monitoring; comprehensive dispute resolution; and provision of technical assistance and professional development. These programs were part of the Assistance and Compliance division until FFY 2022 when the division restructured for the purpose of streamlining and maintaining compliance with state and federal laws and regulations. Fiscal monitoring now reports to school finance, dispute resolution to general counsel, and program monitoring to special education. These divisions partner to administer a comprehensive, compliant system of general supervision.

PROGRAM MONITORING

In FFY 2020, MDE initiated a revision of its monitoring process and contracted to develop an online system (Stepwell MN) and an annual statewide record review for indicator data collection. With the new system, a random statewide sample is generated from the most recent enrollment data reported through the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS). In FFY 2021, indicator data collection record reviews were completed through the new Stepwell MN online system, and in FFY 2022, correction of noncompliance was completed and tracked using the same system for the first time.

MDE continues to move toward a risk-based, cyclical monitoring process. SEAU's have been divided into five cohorts, and MDE analyzes risk data annually to identify SEAU's with a greater need for support and assistance. Those identified as needing less support complete a targeted record review, receive universal technical assistance, and may complete other monitoring activities as needed. The primary focus of monitoring is on those SEAU's identified with greater needs. Once an SEAU has been identified as needing additional program monitoring, they enter a three-phase monitoring process. First, MDE gathers additional data from the SEAU to understand their current policies, practices, and procedures. In the second phase, the monitoring may include additional record reviews, site visits, facility reviews, and staff interviews as needed. The monitoring activities in the second phase are differentiated based on the needs identified through the risk analysis and initial data collection and review activities completed during the first phase of the monitoring. The third and final phase of the monitoring involves completion of corrective actions designed to address any identified noncompliance and targeted technical assistance and coaching for the SEAU.

FISCAL MONITORING

MDE's fiscal monitors work to ensure that Part C funds are appropriately administered and used to serve eligible children. An annual risk assessment is completed to determine if an SEAU is considered low, medium, or high risk. Low risk entities benefit from regular training opportunities, online resources, lower risk of monitoring, and open communication with the fiscal team. Medium risk entities have targeted monitoring on one topic area that is considered higher risk across the state. High-risk entities receive a full, comprehensive review covering all seven major topic areas and online interviews with staff. Once the SEAU's have been stratified into an appropriate risk category, the fiscal monitors utilize data from the Special Education Data Reporting Application (SEDRA) and the MARSS to pick samples related to time and effort, procurement, and transportation. Information is requested from SEAU's for inventory management. Corrective action by the SEAU takes place in the year following fiscal monitoring and may include documenting processes, changing documents to contain appropriate data, or making corrections within the SEDRA or MARSS systems for accuracy. MDE reserves the right to reclaim funds if deemed used for ineligible purposes. The fiscal monitoring team receives fiscal complaints and conducts targeted reviews. When complaints are received, the review is led by the fiscal supervisor and assisted by a fiscal monitor. A complaint can be filed about any entity that provides publicly funded intervention services directly to eligible children and their families. Before filing a complaint, MDE encourages the complainant to first contact the district's special education director to attempt resolution. Once a fiscal review is opened, documentation on the nature of the complaint is requested. Interviews with staff and an on-site visit may be conducted. If a violation is found and corrective action is necessary, a corrective action plan is developed and completed within a specified timeframe. MDE ensures that corrective action plans are implemented and completed within one year.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION

MDE's comprehensive dispute resolution system includes the alternative dispute resolution (ADR) program, state complaint system, and the due process complaint and hearing system to ensure that all infants and toddlers with dis/abilities and their families receive early intervention services.

MDE's ADR program provides conflict resolution assistance for parents, early intervention service (EIS) providers, and public agencies. Mediation or facilitated team meetings address issues of conflict, and MDE provides a neutral third person to help reach resolution. A facilitated team meeting may be appropriate when the team seeks to develop an Individualized Family Services Plan (IFSP). Mediation may be appropriate when parents and lead agencies seek to build positive working relationships and resolve disagreements. Both ADR options have online forms for parties to submit for participation, and participation is voluntary for all parties.

Any organization or individual may file a state complaint against any public agency or EIS provider on behalf of any eligible infant or toddler. Before a complaint is filed, MDE encourages contact with the school district's special education director. The state complaint must allege a violation occurred not more than one year prior to the date that the complaint was received by MDE. When MDE receives a complaint, an investigator reviews this to determine the investigative issues. The investigator contacts the complainant to learn more about the issues, claims, and facts, and conducts an independent investigation. The complainant has the opportunity to submit additional information and the public agency or EIS provider also has opportunity to respond. Based upon a review of all relevant information, MDE makes an independent determination regarding whether a violation of IDEA has occurred. Unless exceptional circumstances exist, MDE issues a written decision containing findings of fact and reasons for MDE's final decision within 60 days after a complaint is filed. If a violation is found, MDE issues corrective action to complete within one calendar year.

Disputes over identification, evaluation, education placement, or provision of a free appropriate public education to an eligible infant or toddler may also be resolved by filing a due process complaint requesting an impartial hearing. Parents, public agencies, and EIS providers may use mediation, conciliation, or another mutually agreed-upon alternative before proceeding to a hearing. Information is available on the MDE website (<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/sped/conf/>) including an optional due process complaint form, information on low-cost legal resources, and Minnesota's procedural safeguards notice. MDE works with the Office of Administrative Hearings to educate parents, public agencies, and EIS providers on their rights and responsibilities about due process hearing resolution sessions. Most due process complaints are settled without a hearing. MDE continues to receive documentation regarding when resolution sessions are held and the results.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

The Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) Team at the Minnesota Department of Education (MDE) supports systems and local programs to implement high-quality, evidence-based services that center families in ways that honor the strengths, cultures, and self-identified priorities of each and every eligible infant and toddler and their families, so that families experience positive self-identified outcomes.

MDE uses a variety of mechanisms to provide technical assistance to early childhood special education leaders, providers, and collaborating partners. Our website is a source of information for caregivers, administrators, service providers, regional partners, and other entities including our Governor's Children's Cabinet. The ECSE team hosts an annual forum for new ECSE leaders, and a number of intra-and-interagency collaborative initiatives such as participation in an Early Learning Open Office Hours were topics of interest by early childhood communities are addressed; and participation in presentations led by interagency programs like Child Protection and Early Intensive Developmental and Behavioral Intervention (EIDBI) both through the Department of Human Services. Minnesota has continued to offer hybrid and virtual methods of technical assistance, ensuring more equitable access to supports across our state and Tribal Nation lands. Our monthly virtual leadership calls deliver timely technical assistance, resources, and presentations from collaborative partners. The monthly leadership calls are also an opportunity for leaders to share with one another, problem solve, and operationalize learnings. Foundational webinars remain available on the MDE ECSE website along with opportunities to debrief with MDE staff during live Question and Answer (Q&A) sessions. Additional resources available to our leaders and practitioners can be found at <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/early/ecse/bc/>.

Our Part C Data and Fiscal Manager also created district-specific Data Dashboards for child outcomes to support data-informed decision-making for ongoing program improvement, as well as providing direct consultation to districts for student reporting and maximization of funding. Our Part C Coordinator continues to provide monthly TA support to the Regional Interagency Early Intervention Committees (IEICs), the primary base of Minnesota's public awareness and outreach work. Additionally, our team utilizes an ECSE team email box to allow local programs to receive timely, high-quality answers to their technical questions. To ensure consistency and alignment across agency and programs, the questions and answers from the mailbox are catalogued for reference and analyzed for themes to identify broader Technical Assistance (TA) and professional development (PD) needs being addressed throughout the year in expanded capacities.

In efforts to better coordinate systems and programming for caregivers participating in Part C, the ECSE Team collaborated with other early childhood partners in FFY 2022:

- Regular Open Office Hours focusing on topics applicable to early care and education including infants, toddlers, and young children with disabilities through one of our ECSE Specialists
- Dream Catcher sessions with American Indian Home/School Liaisons as part of efforts to increase collaboration between American Indian Education and supports for caregivers and early childhood special education through our Part C Coordinator (<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/MDE086456>)
- Minnesota Learn the Signs Act Early (<https://addm.umn.edu/ltsae>) Interagency committee through multiple ECSE Team members
- Various projects in partnership with Special Education, Low Incidence Provider groups, and Early Hearing Detection and Intervention initiatives supporting infants and toddlers with sensory loss (e.g. https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=PROD034482&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary) through one of our ECSE Specialists and our Part B/619 and CSPD Coordinator
- Collaboration with Early/Head Start agency staff to create program collaboration grids (https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=PROD034546&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary) through one of our ECSE Specialists and our Part B/619 and CSPD Coordinator
- Supportive communications and outreach in coordination with our Center for Inclusive Child Care organization. (<https://www.inclusivechildcare.org/>) through one of our ECSE Specialists
- Continued direct involvement with Help Me Connect (<https://helpmeconnect.web.health.state.mn.us/HelpMeConnect>) serving as our Part C resource directory through our Part C Coordinator on the Planning and Leadership Team

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Strengthening our professional development system for both the field and the ECSE team continues to be a priority. During FFY 2022, the ECSE Team benefitted from the following TA to continue systems improvements for infants, toddlers, caregivers, and Part C programs:

- Developing trauma-and-healing-informed practices in early childhood E-learning modules in partnership with the Child Health and Development Institute (CHDI)
- Developing Best Practices in Early Intervention e-Learning modules in partnership with the Family, Infant, and Preschool Program (FIPP).
- Developing Reflective Practice e-Learning modules in partnership with Center Early Education and Development (CEED) at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities
- Data systems support including intra-agency partners through The Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) and Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), most specifically in transforming our Family Outcome Survey (FOS) and procedures
- National Part C Racial Equity Community in partnership with ECTA and additional statewide intensive work with Dr. Rosemarie Allen supporting systems-level change at the regional and local levels
- Intensive systems-level TA through ECTA supporting our ICC and Regional Interagency Early Intervention Committees (IEICs) in review of all statutes, policies, and implementation related to early childhood special education through an equity foundation continuing with "child find"
- System-level racial equity support and intra-and-interagency collaboration from the BUILD Initiative
- The CPSD workgroups supported the recommendation of the adoption of the national early intervention/early childhood special education standards as Minnesota's ECSE personnel standards. The CPSD workgroup worked closely with our licensing agency on this process

Minnesota Department of Education continues to support the direction, organization, and design of the Minnesota Centers of Excellence for Young Children with Disabilities (MNCoe). MNCoe, as part of our CSPD, works to connect, support, and empower local leaders to build capacity. Through these joint efforts, young children and their families are accessing and benefiting from high-quality programs and services throughout the state. Additionally, the MNCoe and the MDE ECSE team are working to build more foundational best practices resources, content, and implementation guides

that will be readily available to leaders and practitioners across the state.

The MNCoE includes the following structural components:

1. Professional Development Facilitators (PDFs) located within each region of the state. In alignment with the CSPD and work of the ECSE team, the 12.0 FTE of individuals in this role actively partner with local program ECSE leaders to identify opportunities to improve practitioner and program quality. This is achieved within the CSPD framework of working to improve the quantity, quality, and effectiveness of the early childhood workforce that provides services and interventions to facilitate the development and learning of eligible infants, toddlers, and young children and their families. PDFs partner with local ECSE leaders in their regions to identify the foundational professional development needs of their practitioners and work together to find and create opportunities to address those needs. PDFs also serve as an external coach assisting in the implementation and facilitation of one of three evidence-based innovations available to programs throughout the state (see #3).
2. Consistent use of the frameworks of active implementation.
3. Innovations that are evidence-based, including the Pyramid Model for Infants, Toddlers, and Preschoolers (formerly TACSEI) and Evidence-Based Quality Intervention Practices (EQIP).

The collaborative work of MDE ECSE and MNCoE is focused on administering a comprehensive system of personnel development that ensures ECSE program leaders and practitioners have access to professional development focused on implementing best practices to provide high-quality special education programming to young children and their families. Current collaboration work is being done between the MDE ECSE and MNCoE teams to more closely align the work of MNCoE with the CSPD framework. A priority of this collaboration is to work together to build on the existing PD supports in order to ensure access to a sustainable and equitable professional development system across the state of Minnesota. The shift toward this system of delivery for professional development will allow leaders and practitioners to more readily have access to PD opportunities that maintain and expand their knowledge and skills to ensure they have competence in evidence-based intervention practices to provide high-quality interventions to eligible infants, toddlers, and their families.

During FFY 2022 we continued to target discretionary federal funds to support local programs committing to the implementation of evidence-based innovations. These funds will continue being available to programs over a five-year period to eliminate identified barriers to scaling and sustaining use of these practices.

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Minnesota continues our dedication to doing engagement differently and in ways that center families, caregivers, communities, and programs building the tables they want built with us instead of top-down decisions. In addition to continuation of the mechanisms from previous years, we engaged in next steps for gathering input during our continuation of expanded processes: implementing and completing four Family Engagement grants made possible through the Part C American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act funds (<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/DSE/Grants/PROD058567>); implementation and completing 22 Part C programs grants also made possible through Part C ARP funds (<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/DSE/PROD058583>); continued systems-level in-reach with our 12 regional Interagency Early Intervention Committee (IEIC) teams and our Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Childhood Intervention (ICC); and partnering with the Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board (PELSB) around adoption of new personnel standards for Minnesota early childhood special education teacher licensing.

As shared in last year's SPP/APR, foci of our ARP funds grants were chosen directly through diverse engagement focusing on reaching in to families, caregivers and communities within our ICC, our IEICs, the Dream Catcher Project program staff and liaisons, and the Part C programs providers and leaders using multiple information-capturing methods and a virtual platform to encourage equitable participation, including geographically. Web-based polls allowed for in-the-moment feedback, as well as extended time for participant engagement after live meetings concluded. Use of these information-gathering methods have continued in FFY 2022 for all in-reach opportunities on an on-going basis to encourage reciprocity of communication: participants are always given access to the anonymous results of the polls through slides, reminder emails, and follow-up communication; and the poll results are openly available to anyone else who asks. Another benefit of these poll methods is access to flexible data formatting, recording, and analysis.

In-reach and engagement are nothing without implementation and sharing back with those who opened up to us. Regarding specifically the Part C ARP Funds in-reach, FFY 2022 was a year of implementing what we learned into next steps of the action through sub-granting as a state for the first time in Part C. The Family Engagement and Part C program grants were a year-long process of both listening deeper and trying things out to see if we got it right as we begin ongoing feedback cycles for Part C in Minnesota. These and other activities are discussed in more detail throughout the Indicators and specifically in Indicator 11.

In FFY 2022, families and caregivers were engaged in actionable and historical ways for Minnesota's Part C system. For the first time ever in our Minnesota Part C systems implementation, we paused and intentionally asked families and caregivers to share with us through four community-led subgrants over a period of 15 months what their experiences, concerns, joys, and needs have been through Minnesota's Part C services. Every step of the process was family, caregiver, and community led, and reporting back to MDE and local programs at the end of the subgrants was encouraged to align with the specific communities' knowledge-sharing styles who participated in the in-reach. While we are at the beginning stages of next action steps coming from this engagement process with families and caregivers, it is already clear that each and every story and experience shared through these Family Engagement grants will impact our interagency early childhood system in addition to local implementation of Part C programming. It is significant to note that Family Engagement grantees were also encouraged to create a plan of sharing back directly with the families, caregivers, and communities who participated in the in-reach to honor what happens with their knowledge-sharing and to create cyclical communication with families, caregivers, and communities for the years of action ahead.

While all families with infants and toddlers who may or are receiving Part C services in Minnesota were included in the focus of engagement and in-reach during FFY 2022 and will benefit from the engagement, intentional focus was the intersectionality of dis/ability and American Indian families and caregivers, Families of Color, families who speak Heritage languages, families who experience homelessness and/or near homelessness, families experiencing wealth inequities, families with caregiver(s) who have dis/abilities or mental health needs, and families and caregivers with child protection involvement. This is reflected throughout Minnesota's Part C SPP/APR, including Indicator 11.

Given this was a year of intentional listening and action engagement with families and caregivers, the breadth of in-reach with additional community partners was also focused on thought-partnering amid action. We continued in-reach of diverse early childhood partners at each monthly ECSE Leadership call, the Open Office Hours our team supports through the Early Learning Services department, technical assistance and follow-up opportunities, and robust interagency collaboration for child protection processes and new low-incidence supports. Consistent and pivotal engagement action also continued as always with multi-year Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) and monthly Interagency Early Intervention Committee (IEIC) meetings, where members were actively engaged in determining table-building and discussions of statute and structure needs in Part C moving forward into the coming year as we work to keep children and families centered during the transition for Part C to a new Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) (<https://mn.gov/mmb/dcyf-implementation/>).

Also important to note, the work of the CSPD includes ongoing engagement with parents, ECSE practitioners and leaders, childcare representatives, institutes of higher education (IHEs), the Department of Human Services (DHS), the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH), Professional Educator Licensing and Standards Board (PELSB), the Center for Early Education and Development (CEED), Professional Development Facilitators (PDFs), Regional Low Incidence Providers (RLIFs), Minnesota Centers of Excellence for Young Children with Disabilities (MNCoe), and PACER Center through participation in each CSPD workgroup.

Apply stakeholder input from introduction to all Part C results indicators. (y/n)

NO

Number of Parent Members:

200

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

As we continue building in-reach of families and caregivers in Minnesota's engagement process for target setting, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress, we expanded family and caregiver engagement this past year in the following ways, with additional intentional strategies being put in place for the coming year:

1. We continued honoring parent membership on the Governor's Interagency Council on Early Childhood Intervention (ICC) in number and through greater representation of race/ethnicity, gender, and geographical region and continued adjusting of the timing of meetings to prioritize parents' needs; parents may also receive payment and reimbursement for child care following state policies per our ICC bylaws once they are state vendors.
2. Parent members of our ICC are present and actively engaged at each ICC meeting, and a parent has sat as our ICC Chair for the last five years.
3. Representation from our Parent Training and Information Center (PTIC), including advocacy and Cultural Liaison staff, continues active engagement in every in-reach and engagement opportunity we provide through MDE, including receiving one of our Part C ARP funds grants specifically for Family Engagement – our PTIC focused on Greater Minnesota in their in-reach efforts through their community Cultural Liaison staff to ensure in-reach intersectionality also included geographically diverse communities.
4. We supported four specific Family Engagement Part C ARP funds grants extended through September 30, 2023 that directly engaged well over 150 caregivers in ways we have never done before in Part C – the foci all came from family, caregiver, and community engagement and focused on families' and caregivers' experiences with Part C in a variety of ways to help inform continued building of new tables determined by families, caregivers, and communities and continuous improvement of the Part C systems currently in place supporting children and families including interagency partners.
5. We began a contract with the Wilder Foundation (<https://www.wilder.org/>) for a complete redesign of our Family Outcomes Survey, which includes a proposal for in-reach with 100 additional families to help shape new questions, create a new form, and implement new processes that align with communities ways of knowledge-sharing across Minnesota and the 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us as this contract is set to complete in June 2024.

Since this intentional in-reach with families and caregivers specifically continues to be a newer process for MDE in these in-depth ways, and since our Family Engagement grants ended on September 30, 2023, developing improvement strategies and evaluating progress will continue over the coming year and additional updates will again be reported in the SPP/APR submitted February 1, 2025.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

Describe the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

We remain dedicated to supporting families and caregivers from each and every community in Minnesota and 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us, creating and building the Part C tables with us moving ahead through continuous improvement, especially as we transition Part C to the new Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF). We also know this way of partnering takes more time, in part as we continue building trust in the communities farthest from opportunities and most impacted by historical and current educational trauma, including Communities of Color across Minnesota and for American Indian relatives living on and off Tribal Nation lands. This past year, we focused on five main cycles of action intended to increase the capacity of diverse groups of families and caregivers in supporting the development and implementation of systems, policies, and procedures intended to improve outcomes for each and every eligible infant and toddler and their families. These five cycles of action are closely intertwined.

First, we stayed in the cycle of action for our Family Outcomes Survey (FOS). We continued our intensive TA with ECTA and DaSy. We processed continued in-reach information through avenues such as regular Family Engagement grantees update gatherings. And we continued in-reach and virtual polls with providers and leaders around current FOS processes, ways individual programs envision a better process, and sharing-out from MDE with local programs and additional early childhood partners (e.g. ICC, superintendents and directors of local programs) the racially disparate data we have been analyzing around surveys past and present. We continue sharing the message that the FOS data we receive from families and caregivers is our most critical data, because not only is every survey a caregiver's story we need to hear, but we also need to be hearing the stories of the families and caregivers who choose not to fill out the FOS. And we began a year-long intensive contract with the Wilder Foundation (<https://www.wilder.org/>) to help

create a new Family Outcomes Survey that is meaningful to both families and programs, aligns with culturally-supportive language and information-gathering methods, increases equitable and demographically-matched participation from families experiencing Part C in Minnesota, and continues answering the federal reporting questions for Indicator 4 on the SPP/APR in ways that make sense for families and encourage improvements within the systems at all levels. The in-reach with families through Wilder's contribution in this work includes a number of intentional actions to increase the capacity of diverse groups of families, including an intentional focus on American Indian families living on and off Tribal Nation lands and additional communities who are made to be most marginalized through "race and place" in Minnesota; conducting in-reach with diverse families through staff who are from the focus communities; ensuring compensation for families' time; adhering to strict data privacy with families' stories gathered to support increased trust with governmental entities for families who share; and including cultural liaisons and Heritage language translators in the in-reach groups to enhance the ways we are learning to better engage and actively involve diverse families in their knowledge moving forward in capacity-building within methods individual diverse communities and families vocalize they need and prefer (e.g. providing a Family Outcomes Survey form that goes beyond simply translation and encompasses language and ways of asking questions that align with diverse understandings of the federally-required questions such as "knowing rights" for families who are undocumented and think about rights from additional experiences with this term).

The second and third cycles of action are intertwined at an intimate level: the continued work of our ICC and our regional Interagency Early Intervention Committees (IEICs) diving together into Minnesota's "child find" and public awareness and outreach through both systems and work-in-action level equity. This past year, these two groups unified even deeper through continued consistent meetings supported through TA from ECTA, intentional equity-focused work plans and group discussion around barriers to reaching the families and caregivers made to be most marginalized by "race and place" in Minnesota from Part C through the connection to high school graduation who we know are missing, and growing in our data literacy knowledge as we work towards building a platform the IEICs can use for both state and local level awareness and outreach data.

The fourth cycle of action we focused on this year to continue increasing capacity and diversity of families and caregivers supporting and leading new table building with us are our Family Engagement grants (<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/DSE/Grants/PROD058567>). These grants were intentionally set up in both process and foci to ensure American Indian families and caregivers, Families and Caregivers of Color, and families who use Heritage languages are directly and intentionally engaged in in-depth in-reach opportunities around our Part C systems, programs, processes, and collaborations. The grants were written to remove dominant culture point acquisition processes during the application and review process; encouragement for activities and evaluation of grant outcomes to be reported to MDE and local programs in ways that uniquely match the communities of their foci instead of requiring SMART goals; and using priority points to move applicants into a space of honoring our First Nations, focusing on communities made to be most marginalized, and creating space for community partners to apply for and lead these grants instead of government or large entities who can usually apply for competitive contracts. We recognize that the impact of the in-reach with the wonderfully diverse families and caregivers through these grants in ways we have never engaged families and caregivers before in Minnesota and Tribal Nations inform every part of our programming, policies, statutes, and systems. This is our hope. We are committed to honoring all that has been shared, in part by continuing these new ways of family and caregiver in-reach efforts through cyclical processes moving ahead. More about direct impact of diverse voices will be included in our SPP/APR submission for FFY 2023, as we are beginning to dig into the reports shared back with MDE at the writing of our SPP/APR. We remain committed to no longer designing systems of impact without the inclusion of those most impacted by our Part C systems and processes, and doing so without barriers and unintended oppression as we move through our SSIP implementation.

The fifth cycle of action we focused on this year was in-reach around the new Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF). While MDE and the ECSE Team are not leading the implementation efforts, we were directly involved in (and continue to be) in-reach with families and caregivers, Part C program leaders and providers, community partners, and additional early childhood partners around a variety of topics helpful to the Implementation Office for DCYF specifically around the transition of Minnesota's Part C Program to DCYF as its lead agency. Our Part C Coordinator facilitated direct in-reach with the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council on Early Childhood Intervention (ICC), our ECSE Team facilitated multiple instances of direct in-reach with Part C program leaders and providers, and the ICC and regional Interagency Early Intervention Committees (IEICs) are supporting dissemination of a broad family and caregiver survey intended to impact the transition of Part C to DCYF as well as additional ideas for implementation moving forward.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Solicitation of public input continues in a number of ways. Our primary method in general for public information sharing continues to be posting federal reporting and Part C Grant Application public comment period information on our Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) website (<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/about/adv/active/ICC/>). Public opportunity is also always encouraged during our ICC meetings, which are posted in advance on the MDE public calendar along with an open Zoom link without restriction by code to ensure easy access for anyone who wishes to attend. The ICC voted again this past year to have all meetings held virtually in order to encourage participation from the public and membership where distance and time may previously have been a factor, and they will also be starting workgroups for FFY 2023 which will be open to Friends of the ICC and the public. Our Core Stakeholder group also facilitates ongoing data analysis, needs and improvement of strategies, and ongoing evaluation on all aspects of our programming on an as-needed basis. Public participation is encouraged from all geographical regions with an emphasis again this past year through virtual methods on rural areas that traditionally have not been able to attend public engagement opportunities due to distance from our main MDE location in Central Minnesota.

In addition to support from our Governor's office in expanding participation on our ICC, including direct connections with the public, we continue building relationships with Tribal partners in order to increase American Indian family, caregiver and community engagement in all aspects of targets, data analysis, improving strategies, and evaluating progress. We also continue intentionally reaching out through listservs and other methods such as forums to our partners in early care and education, including Early Head Start and Head Start, general education and preschool programs, Regional Low Incidence providers across the state, and new regional community hubs through our Preschool Development Grant. And with the new Department of Children, Youth and Families, we have supported a number of public engagement and in-reach opportunities for feedback ranging from Part C providers and leaders to caregivers and ICC members.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the setting targets, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

MDE uses a variety of methods to share information with the public, and plans to expand our engagement mechanisms and processes in the coming year as we learn better the needs of the public and the communities we serve through the Part C ARP funds grants in-reach recently completed.

Ongoing efforts include the MDE website, our ECSE Team and ICC webpages, listservs and GovDelivery, as well as additional MDE department newsletters (e.g. Special Education, COVID-19 updates, and partnering interagency newsletters). MDE capitalizes on regular live opportunities with our ICC, the IEIC regional teams, our Core Stakeholder group, and monthly ECSE Leadership calls. Use of online survey systems allow MDE to schedule and track participant lists for listening sessions, share slides and additional important information on all components of the work with participants, and contact these partners for the purpose of data analysis, development of improvement strategies, and evaluation. Timelines for most of these mechanisms is ongoing. In addition, the ICC, IEIC regional teams, Core Stakeholder group, and ECSE Leadership calls occur mostly monthly. Through the stakeholder engagement process, we hope to learn and incorporate additional strategies and mechanisms for public access to information and active engagement opportunities.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

MDE makes an annual determination on the performance of each Special Education Administrative Unit (SEAU) against specific criteria. MDE reviews all SEAU performance against targets in the Annual Performance Report (APR) and determines whether each SEAU meets the requirements of Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).

MDE publicly reports the performance of each SEAU by member district in its Data Center website under the Special Education District Profiles section. Performance on Part C indicators 1-8 is displayed on a data sheet that includes the program performance, the state rate, and the state target. These district data profiles can be found at the Data Reports and Analytics webpage. The URL is <https://public.education.mn.gov/MDEAnalytics/DataTopic.jsp?TOPICID=550>. In addition, regular updates are shared with ECSE Leadership regarding data and implementation of the SPP/APR and State Systemic Implementation plan, as well as interactive engagement as driven by the field or the ECSE Team. This reporting platform is currently being redesigned and built to be ready for April 2024 publish. At that time, we will be able to update the link. For now, the link included above remains the historical data sample. See "Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR" for a more detailed account of the issues that were identified and the solution response.

Additionally, SEAU's are provided with integrated dashboards of their child outcomes data. Within these data dashboards, leaders can look at performance outcomes for their programs and can also disaggregate their data by race, dis/ability, time in service, etc. Leaders can rely on this data to look at program trends, monitor data quality issues, and support practitioners in program improvements.

A complete copy of Minnesota's SPP and APR are located on MDE's website on the landing page from the Governor's Interagency Coordinating Council. The URL is <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/about/adv/active/ICC/>. The ICC also voted the SPP and APR stand as our state's annual legislative report on Part C, which can be found each year at <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/about/rule/leg/rpt/index.htm>.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

While the State has publicly reported on the FFY 2020 (July 1, 2020-June 30, 2021) performance of each EIS program or provider located in the State on the targets in the State's performance plan as required by sections 616(b)(2)(C)(ii)(I) and 642 of IDEA, those reports did not, as specified in the OSEP Response, contain all of the required information. With its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide a Web link demonstrating that the State has fully reported to the public on the performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR for FFY 2020. In addition, the State must report with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, how and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each early intervention service program or provider located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

Minnesota provides a web link accessible to the public on the performance of each early intervention service program located in Minnesota on the SPP/APR targets on the Minnesota Department of Education website. This information can be found at the following URL: <https://public.education.mn.gov/MDEAnalytics/DataTopic.jsp?TOPICID=8>. In response to OSEP's findings and required action, Minnesota discovered that there were programming issues and updates that needed to be completed. Previous issues included inaccurate recording and delineation of districts that had been monitored and the date they were monitored as part of a monitoring cycle related to compliance standards. In Minnesota, we also have a significant number of cooperative local education agencies in which membership of districts periodically change which was leading to inaccuracies in performance indicators. In response to this, Minnesota has built a new dashboard for reporting performance and compliance indicators that can be filtered by individual district and is more easily navigated. This will be made available to the public Spring of 2024, and the current link for public access will also automatically redirect.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA Section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. § 303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support the State lead agency's submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with the State's SPP/APR documents.

The State did not provide a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents.

Intro - Required Actions

The State has not provided a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In its FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must provide the required information.

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2023 and 2024 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2024 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on

which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
282	287	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

5

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Of the 287 records reviewed, there were no reported delays in the provision of early intervention services due to district causes. All five documented delays were due to exceptional family circumstances in which the child or family was not available to provide services earlier.

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

As determined through extensive stakeholder engagement, Minnesota has updated the definition of "timely" to mean services beginning not more than 30 calendar days following the date of informed written consent, unless otherwise agreed upon by the parent and district.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

In FFY 2020, MDE initiated revision of its monitoring process and contracted development of an online system for conducting an annual statewide record review for indicator data collection, moving away from MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system, which was determined to be at "end of life" for reliability, and the cyclical monitoring process used in the past, which did not differentiate monitoring based on SEAU needs. MDE completed the record review for FFY 2022 using this new online system. The process for FFY 2022 included generating a random statewide sample for each of the indicators. For Indicator C-1, the sample pulled records from the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS). Records were selected from the most recent statewide enrollment data for children identified as receiving Part C services. Once the sample was finalized, districts were notified and asked to complete the review of the record(s) and submit the documentation to MDE. MDE reviewed the documentation submitted and verified a random sample of the reviews. If an SEAU were to identify any noncompliance, MDE would send a formal notification of the noncompliance. The SEAU would need to correct any noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children receiving Part C services and determining whether the services were provided in a timely manner. The FFY 2022 data are based on reviews of records from 118 SEAUs, comprised of 171 individual districts. MDE continues to demonstrate 100% compliance with this indicator, meeting the target and maintaining the baseline of 100%. MDE has updated the baseline to reflect the new SPP cycle. The revised baseline, although still 100%, uses the FFY 2020 data. As MDE has consistently been at 100% for this indicator, the baseline has remained the same.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11

Accessible format can be found at the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP): 2024 Determination Letters on State Implementation of IDEA

Part C

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	90.30%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Data	97.84%	98.06%	98.17%	99.53%	96.94%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Please see Introduction for additional stakeholder engagement information. We are currently analyzing 15-month in-reach that happened directly with families and caregivers through four Part C Family Engagement American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act funds grants which wrapped up on September 30, 2023 for additional ways to consider Indicator 2 and natural environment for infants and toddlers in communities across Minnesota and 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us. We expect continued sharing from families and caregivers around shifts in the COVID-19 pandemic, virtual service delivery methodology, immigration needs across Minnesota, continued dramatically increased referrals, and the necessary systems changes in motion to influence this work as we stay in the cycle of action for children, families, and caregivers. For many families, caregivers, and providers, natural environments have expanded to include additional places infants and toddlers spend their time made possible through virtual service delivery methods, and increased community and cultural responsiveness. Engagement and in-reach also continue to show that expansion of "family" includes caregivers (e.g. grandparents, kinship, in-home child-care) and "natural environments" includes the places infants and toddlers served through Part C spend time with caregivers. A number of families also shared through the Family Engagement grant work that they aren't always comfortable having providers come into their homes for valuable and sometimes cultural reasons. We need to believe and honor what families are sharing with us, including ways they are defining "natural environment" for their families, as we also continue in-reaching around this in the coming year.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	5,950
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey;	08/30/2023	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	6,105

Source	Date	Description	Data
Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age			

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
5,950	6,105	96.94%	95.00%	97.46%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

n/a

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response
2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three Outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk

infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or “developmentally delayed children”) or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or “children with diagnosed conditions”). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets remain as set during the FFY 2020 SPP/APR process. Minnesota continues its work on redesigning the procedures associated with this collection as well as the content of the survey itself. Minnesota intends to develop a new survey to meet this indicator's requirements but more importantly, to better inform early intervention providers of the necessary adjustments and supports that best meet the needs of children and their families. Development of new surveys and processes will happen in direct partnership with providers, leaders, families, caregivers, communities, and additional early childhood partners as outlined in the listening session process utilized for FFY 2020-2025 target setting. In addition, the engagement work currently happening with our ICC informs continuous improvement for Indicator 3.

Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A1	2018	Target>=	54.50%	54.60%	50.50%	50.50%	50.60%
A1	50.35%	Data	50.85%	50.35%	50.12%	49.90%	49.88%
A2	2018	Target>=	53.00%	54.00%	48.50%	48.50%	49.50%
A2	48.37%	Data	48.23%	48.37%	48.38%	48.82%	47.49%
B1	2018	Target>=	60.60%	60.70%	55.90%	55.90%	60.00%
B1	55.80%	Data	55.83%	55.80%	57.61%	55.57%	55.79%
B2	2018	Target>=	46.50%	47.50%	41.80%	41.80%	42.30%
B2	41.67%	Data	41.95%	41.67%	43.43%	41.79%	40.52%
C1	2018	Target>=	62.30%	62.40%	57.80%	57.80%	57.90%
C1	57.74%	Data	59.36%	57.74%	57.83%	59.12%	56.27%
C2	2018	Target>=	54.00%	55.00%	50.10%	50.10%	51.10%
C2	49.99%	Data	49.62%	49.99%	50.69%	50.11%	48.90%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1>=	50.70%	50.80%	50.90%	51.00%
Target A2>=	50.50%	51.50%	52.50%	53.50%
Target B1>=	60.10%	60.20%	60.30%	60.40%
Target B2>=	43.30%	44.30%	45.30%	46.30%
Target C1>=	58.00%	58.10%	58.20%	58.30%
Target C2>=	52.10%	53.10%	54.10%	55.10%

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	13	0.39%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,193	35.64%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	564	16.85%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	734	21.93%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	843	25.19%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,298	2,504	49.88%	50.70%	51.84%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,577	3,347	47.49%	50.50%	47.12%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	12	0.36%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,233	36.84%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	762	22.77%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	903	26.98%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	437	13.06%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,665	2,910	55.79%	60.10%	57.22%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,340	3,347	40.52%	43.30%	40.04%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	18	0.54%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,155	34.51%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	576	17.21%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	900	26.89%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	698	20.85%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,476	2,649	56.27%	58.00%	55.72%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	1,598	3,347	48.90%	52.10%	47.74%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

During analysis, MDE has seen that approximately 500 additional students were reported in FFY 2022 as FFY 2021 COS rating process. Upon close review, the percentage of children who improved function closer to same aged peers or were rated as having skills consisted with same aged peers, decreased by .75% and .6% over the previous rating year. This decrease could be correlated to a one-month average loss in time in Early Intervention services. The students identified in this particular collection were also significantly impacted during the COVID-19 pandemic as it related to access to settings outside of the home in which skills related to functional needs would be most impacted.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting 618 data	5,792
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	1,844
Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed	3,398

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? (yes/no)

YES

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

In Minnesota, LEAs can use a variety of sources to inform ratings on each child's COS: norm-referenced tools administered as part of a child's initial evaluation, parent information or report, and professional observations. All of the sources are used to complete an age-anchored, criterion-referenced assessment tool. This work is informed and supported by the careful use of crosswalk documents developed by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center. In addition, MDE requires that assessments be made within a month of a child's program entry and/or exit date. And, when a child is exiting Part C and transitioning into early childhood special education services under Part B, the child's Part C exit rating previously became their Part B entrance rating. Districts are now able to make a determination as to whether or not the Exit C rating is appropriate for use as an Entry B/619 rating.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” when using Early Childhood Outcomes Center’s (ECO’s) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS Form.

MDE was able to determine that of the 3398 students that exited from Part C services and were assessed via COS, 51 student’s outcome rating could not be reported due to errors in the data submitted to the SEA from the LEA. Additionally, MDE is correcting the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period. This correction is now consistent with what was reported in Part C exiting 618 data.

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, the State must explain any discrepancies between the FFY 2022 total number assessed and the FFY 2022 denominator in its calculation of the percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned three years of age or exited the program.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The discrepancies were caused by transposing outcome progress category d and e counts from Outcome B to Outcome C. When added up, Outcome C had an incorrect total resulting in incorrect outcome summary for C. The denominator for all three should be 2912. We have corrected it above.

The 2944 count of assessed infants and toddlers is the total amount of students with submitted Exit Outcomes Ratings. However, 32 were missing an entrance rating. This resulted in the total of 2912 that could be assigned a progress category. We have changed the total counts of assessed to reflect the measurable count of 2912.

FFY 2022 does not have a discrepancy related to the number of children exiting the program and the number of students used as the denominator in determining the percentage of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area.

3 - OSEP Response

3 - Required Actions

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights)}}{\text{(\# of respondent families participating in Part C)}} \times 100 \right]$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs)}}{\text{(\# of respondent families participating in Part C)}} \times 100 \right]$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn)}}{\text{(\# of respondent families participating in Part C)}} \times 100 \right]$.

Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

States will be required to compare the current year's response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group)

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2024, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
A	2013	Target>=	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	90.30%	90.60%
A	89.22%	Data	89.24%	92.58%	91.09%	82.97%	87.41%
B	2013	Target>=	93.80%	94.00%	94.20%	93.40%	93.60%

B	92.58 %	Data	91.96%	95.35%	93.87%	88.36%	90.48%
C	2013	Target>=	91.20%	91.50%	91.80%	90.60%	90.90%
C	89.80 %	Data	89.51%	94.21%	92.00%	87.05%	90.48%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A>=	91.00%	91.50%	92.00%	92.50%
Target B>=	93.80%	94.00%	94.20%	94.40%
Target C>=	91.20%	91.50%	91.80%	92.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets remain as set during the FFY 2020 SPP/APR process. Minnesota continues its work on redesigning the procedures associated with this collection as well as the content of the survey itself. Minnesota is in process with intensive TA through DaSY and ECTA and a contract through Wilder Foundation (referenced in the Introduction including weblink) for developing a new survey to meet this indicator's requirements in ways that better center each and every family in Minnesota and the 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us, and that will also better inform early intervention providers of the necessary adjustments and supports that best meet the needs of children and their families. Part C ARP funds Family Engagement and district/cooperative grants this past year have allowed for direct engagement with families and caregivers, providers, leaders, community partners, and additional early childhood collaborators in processes similar to those outlined in the listening session processes utilized in FFY 2021 for target setting. This feedback is directly influencing our work for the redesign, as well as the contract through Wilder including in-reach with approximately 100 additional families specific to Minnesota's Family Outcomes Survey in all aspects.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	3,398
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	548
Survey Response Rate	16.13%
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	468
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	548
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	504
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	548
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	497
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	548

Measure	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	87.41%	91.00%	85.40%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	90.48%	93.80%	91.97%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	90.48%	91.20%	90.69%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for part A slippage, if applicable

Over the course of the last few years of listening to families and what they understand as it relates to the concept of “rights” in early intervention, we have learned that we have work to do in defining what “rights” mean to families and understanding what “rights” mean for them. Not only do we need to help families of each and every culture we serve in understanding the relevance and association of rights as it relates to the services and supports of early intervention (and all special education processes), we need to work to empower families to be strong advocates for their children and families that is culturally-relevant and healing informed. The COVID-19 pandemic had a significant impact on the connections and relationships of providers and families and we believe that in those relationships and continuity of services is where learning occurs, and a feeling of support and empowerment is made.

Additionally of noted importance is that we still do not have a significant number of surveys returned and a demographically proportionate representation of surveys. As we work through the development of a more culturally supportive, relevant and actionable survey, we intend to have a greater data source (amount being returned) as well as data that will help better inform the supports necessary to build the capacity in families as well as the practitioners that are supporting them.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Question	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO

Response Rate

FFY	2021	2022
Survey Response Rate	16.30%	16.13%

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Percentage +/- 4% metric was used and the comparison data utilized was child count data for children ages 0, 1, and 2 years of age within a school year.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another category approved through the stakeholder input process.

Of the records that we are able to disaggregate, the demographic analysis of race indicates the following: 64% of Part C children exiting services were indicated to be white, while this group made up 75.44% of returned surveys. Another rather large discrepancy in return rate is for children identified as Black or African American for which they represented 12.1% of children exiting early intervention services but only 6% of returned surveys. A similar discrepancy is found with the return rate of children identifying as Hispanic/Latine compared to those that are exiting the program, 8.36% and 11.2% respectively. Another area of discrepancy in this year’s data is for children identified as Asian. The percentage of children exiting services and identifying as Asian is 5.0% and yet made up 5.87% of the returned surveys.

Additionally, we have many districts with varying methods of administering the survey that impacts the rate of return. While this is not correlating with geographical area and/or school district or cooperative organization directly, it is still relevant in the redesign of not only the survey itself, but also the way in which it is administered. The new survey will also allow for families an opportunity to self-identify the race, ethnicity, and home language for their child on the survey itself. This will afford the state the opportunity to ensure that the data representing demographics of the children and family served are valid and reliable, since there are still processes and systems in use in Minnesota that either require a provider to determine race/ethnicity for a child if the family does not share this information, and/or when race/ethnicity is left blank, “white” is the default fill-in answer. We are also working to honor needs identified through relationships with Tribal Nation and Native partners that being Indigenous is not a “race” or “ethnicity”, but rather an identity tied to place.

In addition to our continued dedication to ensuring families responding to the Family Outcomes Survey in Minnesota and the 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us is representative of each and every community we serve, we have also determined geographic location to be a significant factor in Minnesota for our response rates. Geographic location not only has come up both organically and formally through a variety of in-reach opportunities with families and caregivers, providers, and early childhood partners, but we also know from a plethora of national research that “race and place” continue being direct determiners of a child’s and family’s ability to meet their self-determined outcomes in Part C and beyond. In reviewing our limited data set, we were able to organize categories of commonality as it relates to locations around Minnesota. We were particularly interested in the

representativeness of the rate of return of surveys. Minneapolis and St. Paul school districts, holding a significance in the amount of children served, have a return rate of 2% compared to the statewide rate of 8.95%. Our suburban school districts within the metropolitan area, as well as service cooperatives as well as rural Minnesota districts with a student population of less than 1000 pupils, all exceed our state average with return rates of 10-15%. Given the high concentration of Children of Color in urban districts, the return rates of those two districts ensure that we are not supporting representative amounts of survey returns for Children of Color.

The demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Minnesota is currently in the second year of a two-year process of intensive technical assistance activities to address our overall Family Outcomes Survey process, actual survey, and the further development of family/caregivers supports to ensure that common language is understood in culturally supportive ways, that the intentions addressed by this indicator for rights and expectations are universally clear, and that turn-around reporting to school districts is available and meaningful. In the new survey, family/caregivers completing the survey will have the option to self-identify race and ethnicity as well as home language. There will also be additional ways the survey can be distributed, and answers can be captured that will better align with each and every community's knowledge-sharing that we serve in Minnesota and the 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us. These methods are being determined through family and community in-reach through our contract with Wilder Foundation. These changes will help ensure a more meaningful survey and process for families and providers and also ensure that we have accurate demographic information for more valid and reliable data analysis.

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The new survey currently in development will allow for families another opportunity to self-identify the race, ethnicity and home language for their child on the survey itself. This will afford the state the opportunity to ensure that the data representing demographics of the children and family served are valid and reliable. Additionally, guidance will be provided to districts on the methods of administration that may include interpretation or liaison services in completion, completion of the survey more frequently (consideration being taken to have the survey administered to families at annual IFSP meeting with service coordinator support), and mechanisms to orally respond to the survey. Our intensive TA and contract with the Wilder Foundation will be underway through June 2024 at the earliest, so additional specifics will be shared in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR Indicator 4.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Minnesota has been very aware (through community and family engagement as well as engagement with practitioners) that many of the survey questions that are asked of families are not culturally relevant or understood in the intent meant by Indicator 4 and therefore are biased in their presentation. For example, the concept of "rights" has varied understanding across the cultures served in Minnesota, including families who may be currently undocumented families. The response to these concerns is the reason for working to redesign the survey, create more relevant and timely feedback loops, and ensure that families are empowered in advocating for the priorities they have for their children's growth and development.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Minnesota has made determinations that the Family Outcome Survey administration and content must be improved for a number of reasons, one of which is ensuring that racial, ethnic, and American Indian distribution and sharings through the survey are the most significant and simultaneously part of multiple intersectionality factors in meeting the needs of our families/caregivers through a greater return rate for meaningful action and change. We also want to ensure that we are asking meaningful questions for families/caregivers to determine if we are meeting these outcomes in culturally responsive ways. It is also critical that this data become data that districts have returned to them for program improvement purposes, and that communication between the state, Part C programs, and families/caregivers is enhanced in ways that lead to truly better outcomes for each and every child and family in Minnesota and 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us.

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2022 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The response data from surveys for FFY 2022 is not yet representative of the demographics of our infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in our Part C program. Minnesota has been intentional in the work of developing a new survey that is more relevant to the information families/caregivers want to be able to share, that is more actionable for local special education agencies to respond to, and that aligns with the required components of federal reporting for all indicators. Minnesota believes that creating relevance in content and cultural responsiveness in the survey, as well as methods that better support knowledge-sharing of diverse communities, will support more surveys being returned as well as representation of each and every family and community that is consistent with participation in the program.

4 - OSEP Response

When reporting the extent to which the demographics of infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, the State included race/ethnicity and geographic location in its analysis. However, the State did not describe in its analysis if the data were representative by geographic location as it reported "We were particularly interested in the representativeness of the rate of return of surveys." which does not report the extent to which the demographics of infants and toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, as required by the Measurement Table.

4 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2023 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

Additionally, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must include race/ethnicity and at least one other demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process in its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, as required by the Measurement Table.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the *EDFacts* Metadata and Process System (*EMAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.46%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target ≥	1.15%	1.20%	1.21%	1.00%	1.02%
Data	1.05%	0.93%	0.94%	0.71%	0.82%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target ≥	1.04%	1.06%	1.08%	1.10%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Targets remain as set during the FFY 2020 SPP/APR process. Minnesota continues its work on engaging families, caregivers, community members, providers, leaders, early childhood partners, cultural liaisons, and regional teams in ensuring we are continuing to do better for each and every child and family in Minnesota around "child find" and public awareness and outreach as the initial connector for families to early childhood special education in Minnesota and the 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us. This year, our regional Interagency Early Intervention Committee (IEIC) teams dug in deeper through participation in year-long racial equity learning as well as discussion and brainstorming together during in-reach and collaborative opportunities to find gaps they want to address during next year's work plans. The engagement work through our ICC around "child find" and public awareness and outreach statutes and policies begun three years ago also continued in partnership with the regional IEICs for how well we are doing on Indicator 5 for children, families, and referring providers through continuous improvement. This part of our system was also an area of intention through some of the American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act funds' Family Engagement and District/Cooperative grants that ended September 30, 2023. Learnings from these grants will impact decisions made around enhancing our "child find" systems over the coming year and have already had impact on our Help Me Grow Minnesota online referral forms being translated into HMoob/Hmong, Spanish, and Somali.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	548
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021	06/20/2023	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	64,755

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
548	64,755	0.82%	1.04%	0.85%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations . The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.56%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target >=	2.75%	2.82%	3.00%	2.53%	2.60%
Data	2.84%	2.94%	2.96%	2.41%	2.84%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	2.68%	2.75%	2.82%	3.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 6 actions have also continued a priority for Minnesota through engagement and in-reach. At the time of our FFY 2020-2025 target setting in-reach, participants shared about ensuring the definition of "family" is expanded to include additional caregivers such as Early Head Start and Head Start, child care providers, community and ceremonial partners, extended-family for communities that center multi-generational care for infants and young children, which is reflected throughout our report. During our ARP Act family Engagement and District/Cooperative grants, we learned more about the importance of trust-building and relationships that align with communities' ways of sharing knowledge in order to better support families and caregivers through this critical first connection into the early childhood special education process. Minnesota continues its work on engaging families, caregivers, community members, providers, leaders, early childhood partners, cultural liaisons, and regional teams in ensuring we are continuing to do better for each and every child and family in Minnesota around "child find" and public awareness and outreach. In addition, the engagement work currently happening with our ICC around "child find" and public awareness and outreach statutes and policies through an equity focus, as well direct and consistent supports from the ICC and the Part C Coordinator to the regional IECs for grounding equity within their work as the people directly impacting how well we are doing for children, families, and referring providers informs continuous improvement for Indicator 6.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	08/30/2023	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	6,105
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021	06/20/2023	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	194,531

FFY 2022 SPPI/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
6,105	194,531	2.84%	2.68%	3.14%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

n/a

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Measurement

Percent = $\left(\frac{\text{[\# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline]}}{\text{[\# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted]}} \right) \times 100$.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	92.94%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.28%	96.22%	87.84%	92.94%	90.48%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
175	268	90.48%	100%	89.55%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

65

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Ninety-three of the 268 initial evaluations, assessments and IFSP meetings were not completed within the required 45-day timeline. Twenty-four evaluations were identified as late due to a delay in obtaining parental consent. Forty-one Sixty-five evaluations were identified as late due to exceptional family circumstances such as a delay in obtaining parental consent (24 evaluations) or child or parent unavailability for various reasons. Twenty-eight evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings were determined to be late due to district causes. Comments indicate the lateness of these evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings were primarily due to scheduling issues. Other reasons identified include staff illness, miscommunication or documentation errors, and difficulty scheduling interpreter for family.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

In FFY 2020, MDE initiated revision of its monitoring process and contracted development of an online system for conducting an annual statewide record review for indicator data collection, moving away from MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system, which was determined to be at "end of life" for reliability, and the cyclical monitoring process used in the past, which did not differentiate monitoring based on SEAU needs. MDE completed the record review for FFY 2022 using the new web-based monitoring system, Stepwell MN. The process for FFY 2022 included generating a random statewide sample for each of the indicators. For Indicator C-7, the sample pulled records from the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) for children newly identified as receiving Part C services. Once the sample was finalized, SEAUs were notified and asked to complete the review of the record(s) and submit the documentation to MDE. MDE reviewed the documentation submitted and verified a random sample of the reviews. SEAUs with identified noncompliance were then formally notified of the noncompliance. The SEAU would need to correct any noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children determined eligible for Part C services and determining whether the evaluation, assessment and initial IFSP meeting was completed within 45 calendar days. The FFY 2022 data are based on reviews of records from 115 SEAUs, comprised of 168 individual districts.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Please see Introduction for additional stakeholder engagement information. Despite not having to set targets for Indicator 7, MDE included discussions of the 45-day timeline in the stakeholder and Tribal Nation engagement sessions. For Indicator 7, discussion focused around possible reasons Minnesota historically has not met 100% for this indicator. Suggestions included providing cultural liaisons, not just interpreters for parents who speak heritage languages; finding ways to be timely while emphasizing relationships with parents; finding ways to enhance supportive accountability for districts; and continuing to use virtual meetings to help with timeliness and full team and parent participation. These suggestions are being combined with learnings from our ARP Family Engagement grants which ended September 30, 2023 for ongoing systems change and improvement for children and families as we transition into a new lead agency July 1, 2024.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
10	10	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.**

In response to the actions required by OSEP in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, MDE has revised its approach to demonstrating correction of noncompliance to include a subsequent review of additional data for all SEAUs with identified noncompliance and not just those with noncompliance deemed to be systemic or chronic. As part of this revised approach, MDE examined each of the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2021 and reviewed updated data from the SEAU to verify correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. The twelve noncompliant records from FFY 2021 resulted in findings of noncompliance for ten SEAUs. Each SEAU was asked to review randomly selected records to demonstrate correction and submit paper reviews to MDE for regulatory compliance. Submitted documentation confirmed that all ten of the SEAUs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. MDE has reviewed updated data from SEAUs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 and verified that each SEAU is correctly implementing 34 CFR § 303.310.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The data collection for the FFY 2021 record review took place prior to the availability of the Student Level Correction component in Stepwell MN. As a result, MDE used spreadsheets to track all identified noncompliance and verify correction. For post-referral timelines, when record reviews were completed, the SEAU provided the date of the referral and the date the evaluation, assessments and initial IFSP meeting were completed. This allowed MDE to verify that the actions had been completed, although they may have been late. If the date of the evaluation, assessments and the initial IFSP meeting was missing, MDE required the SEAU to submit the completed IFSP to demonstrate the evaluation and assessments and IFSP meeting had subsequently been completed, although late. If the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU, the SEAU would submit to MDE the reason (e.g., student moved) and the date of the occurrence to release the SEAU from further demonstration of correction for that specific student. Based on a review of the data, MDE verified all of the evaluations, assessments and initial IFSP meetings had been completed and that each SEAU with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator had completed the evaluations, assessments and IFSP meetings, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation and assessment and IFSP meeting was not timely unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU. All correction of individual student record noncompliance was completed within the one-year timeframe.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In response to the actions required by OSEP in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, MDE has revised its approach to demonstrating correction of noncompliance to include a subsequent review of additional data for all SEAs with identified noncompliance and not just those with noncompliance deemed to be systemic or chronic. MDE verified that all SEAs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements as described in the section "Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements" above. MDE also ensured each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02 as described in the section "Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected" above.

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	92.42%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	92.55%	98.00%	94.74%	92.42%	83.91%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

NO

If no, please explain.

A total of 290 student records were reviewed for this indicator. All records were for children that had received Part C services and were referred for a Part B evaluation. Fourteen of the records were identified as having a transition conference late due to exceptional family circumstances. Fifty-seven records were identified as not in compliance for this indicator.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
219	290	83.91%	100%	80.34%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Minnesota found slippage on Indicator 8A from the FFY 2021 rate of 83.91% to the FFY 2022 rate of 80.34%. This is a decrease of 3.57%. Of the 290 records that were reviewed in FFY 2022, 219 were found in compliance with this indicator and 14 were found not in compliance due to family reasons. Fifty-seven records were identified with noncompliance due to district causes in FFY 2022. As noted, this represents overall slippage from FFY 2021 when 145 of the 174 records were found in compliance and one was not in compliance due to family reasons. In FFY 2021, 28 records were identified with noncompliance due to district causes.

MDE attributes the C8a slippage, in part, to the changes in the sampling and data collection methodologies made in FFY 2020. With the revision of its monitoring process, MDE reframed the sampling process and is now specifically sampling children identified as recently exiting Part C services as opposed to a random district sample. Along with revising the sampling process, MDE revised the record review questions being asked of districts in order to better gather the information needed to accurately report on this indicator. MDE believes the revised questions more accurately reflect the intended measurement of this indicator and will allow MDE to better identify specific components of the noncompliance in order to provide more targeted technical assistance; however, MDE is still working on refining the review questions to ensure noncompliance is being accurately identified. For FFY 2022 MDE sampled a larger number of records and, in turn, identified more noncompliance. MDE continues to work with SEAs to ensure staff understand the requirements related to this indicator and have the supports necessary to meet compliance. This includes technical assistance through the Early Learning Services Division of MDE.

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

14

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

A total of 71 children exiting Part C did not have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday.

Fourteen children had a late transition conference due to exceptional family circumstances or the unavailability of the parent.

Nineteen records were cited because the child did not receive a timely transition conference and the IFSP did not include documentation of the transition steps and services. District comments indicated unknown reasons for why the transition conference was late or not held and why the district failed to document the steps and services as required

Fifteen records had a timely transition conference, but the transition steps and services were not sufficiently documented within the IFSP.

Twenty-three children had IFSPs appropriately documenting transition steps and services, but the transition conference did not take place at least 90 days before the child's third birthday.

Four records identified the reason for delay as scheduling issues.

Eleven records indicated unknown reasons for the delay suggesting the records did not have sufficient detail to determine why the district failed to meet the timeline.

Eight records did not include a date of a transition conference or held the conference early.

All 23 of these records included documented steps and services which would suggest a transition conference was held, perhaps as part of the IFSP meeting, but documentation of a date was not evident.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

In FFY 2020, MDE initiated revision of its monitoring process and contracted for development of an online system to conduct an annual statewide record review for indicator data collection, moving away from MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system, which was determined to be at "end of life" for reliability, and the cyclical monitoring process used in the past, which did not differentiate monitoring based on SEAU needs. MDE completed the record review for FFY 2022 using the new web-based monitoring system, Stepwell MN. The process for FFY 2022 included generating a random statewide sample for each of the indicators. For Indicator 8A, the sample pulled records, based on the most recent statewide enrollment data, from the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) for children identified as exiting Part C services. Once the sample was finalized, SEAUs were notified and required to complete the record reviews and submit the documentation to MDE. MDE reviewed the documentation submitted and verified a random sample of the reviews. If an SEAU identified noncompliance, MDE sent a formal notification of the noncompliance; the SEAU would need to correct any noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children exiting Part C services and reviewing the IFSP to ensure the inclusion of transition steps and services and the timely completion of the transition conference. The FFY 2022 data are based on reviews of records from 122 individual districts representing 99 SEAUs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Please see Introduction for additional stakeholder engagement information. Despite not having to set targets for Indicator 8A, 8B, and 8C during engagement in FFY 2021, MDE discussed all three Indicators in the stakeholder and Tribal Nation sessions. Please note that the information included here includes feedback for all three of the Indicator 8 outcomes – they were discussed all together.

Feedback from participants included challenges for families/caregivers as the family-centered Part C shifted to educational needs of the child in Part B. Some of the considerations shared were ensuring families/caregivers understand different expectations for both children and families/caregivers; supporting systems to honor cultures and beliefs in a classroom instead of home environment; and maintaining close relationships with families/caregivers and collaborating with community partners, cultural liaisons, Head Start, and other trusted partners. Participants also shared continued concerns around COVID-19 and the pressing emergencies of workforce.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	18	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

In response to the actions required by OSEP in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, MDE has revised its approach to demonstrating correction of noncompliance to include a subsequent review of additional data for all SEAUs with identified noncompliance and not just those with noncompliance deemed to be systemic or chronic. As part of this revised approach, MDE examined each of the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2021 and reviewed updated data from the SEAU to verify correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. The 18 SEAUs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 were asked to review subsequent records in FFY 2022. Those records were chosen randomly and submitted to MDE via a paper review for regulatory compliance. Submitted documentation confirmed that all SEAUs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. MDE has thus reviewed updated data from each of the SEAUs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 and verified that each SEAU is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The data collection for the FFY 2021 record review took place prior to the availability of the Student Level Correction component in Stepwell MN. As a result, MDE used spreadsheets to track all identified noncompliance and verify correction. For Part C to Part B transition, when record reviews were completed, the SEAU provided the date the transition conference was held. This allowed MDE to verify that the conference had been completed, although it may have been late. If the transition conference was not held, MDE required the SEAU to verify the successful transition to Part B. If the student were no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU, the SEAU was required to submit to MDE the reason (e.g., student moved) and the date of the occurrence to release the SEAU from further demonstration of correction for that specific student. Based on a review of the data, MDE has verified that all records with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 were corrected and the SEAUs are now in compliance or the student is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. All correction of individual student record noncompliance was completed within the one-year timeframe.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In response to the actions required by OSEP in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, MDE has revised its approach to demonstrating correction of noncompliance to include a subsequent review of additional data for all SEAUs with identified noncompliance and not just those with noncompliance deemed to be systemic or chronic. MDE verified that all SEAUs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements as described in the section "Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements" above. MDE also ensured each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected consistent with OSEP QA 23-01 as described in the section "Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected" above.

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	100.00%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
290	290	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

n/a

Describe the method used to collect these data.

The method used to collect data for this indicator for FFY 2022 began with generating a random statewide sample of children exiting Part C services. For Indicator 8B, the sample pulled records from the most recent statewide enrollment data reported in the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) for children identified as exiting Part C services. Once the sample was finalized, SEAUs were notified and required to complete an online review using the new Stepwell MN system and submit the documentation to MDE. MDE reviewed the documentation submitted and verified a random sample of the reviews. SEAUs with identified noncompliance were then formally notified of the noncompliance. No review questions were asked specific to this indicator as Education is the lead agency for both Part C and Part B services in Minnesota; the notification of the LEA is a seamless process. The FFY 2022 data is comprised of reviews from 122 individual districts representing 99 SEAUs.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)

NO

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

In FFY 2020, MDE initiated revision of its monitoring process and contracted for development of an online system to conduct an annual statewide record review for indicator data collection, moving away from MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system, which was determined to be at "end of life" for reliability, and the cyclical monitoring process used in the past, which did not differentiate monitoring based on SEAU needs. MDE completed the record review for FFY 2022 using the new web-based system, Stepwell MN. The process for FFY 2022 included generating a random statewide sample for each of the indicators. For Indicator 8B, the sample pulled records, based on the most recent statewide enrollment data, from the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) for children identified as exiting Part C services. Once the sample was finalized, SEAUs were notified and required to complete a review of the record(s) and submit the documentation to MDE. MDE reviewed the documentation submitted and verified a random sample of the reviews. If an SEAU identified noncompliance, MDE sent a formal notification of the noncompliance; the SEAU would need to correct any noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

No review questions were asked specific to this indicator as Education is the lead agency for both Part C and Part B services in Minnesota; the notification of the LEA is a seamless process.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children exiting Part C services and potentially eligible for Part B. The FFY 2022 data are based on reviews of records from 122 individual districts representing 99 SEAUs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Please see Introduction for additional stakeholder engagement information. Despite not having to set targets for Indicator 8A, 8B, and 8C during engagement in FFY 2021, MDE discussed all three Indicators in the stakeholder and Tribal Nation sessions. Please note that the information included here includes feedback for all three of the Indicator 8 outcomes – they were discussed all together.

Feedback from participants included challenges for families/caregivers as the family-centered Part C shifted to educational needs of the child in Part B. Some of the considerations shared were ensuring families/caregivers understand different expectations for both children and families/caregivers; supporting systems to honor cultures and beliefs in a classroom instead of home environment; and maintaining close relationships with families/caregivers and collaborating with community partners, cultural liaisons, Head Start, and other trusted partners. Participants also shared continued concerns around COVID-19 and the pressing emergencies of workforce.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

- A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.
- B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.
- C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	96.97%

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	96.30%	96.97%	94.12%	96.97%	90.23%

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. (yes/no)

NO

If no, please explain.

A total of 290 student records were reviewed for this indicator. All records were for children that had received Part C services and were referred to Part B services. Fourteen of the records was identified as having a transition conference late due to exceptional family circumstances. Forty-two records were found not in compliance because the transition conference did not take place at least 90 days before the child's third birthday. There were 26 records where the transition conference was not held in the required timeframe but the records included documented steps and services. There were 16 records that were cited because the child did not receive a timely transition conference and the IFSP did not include any documentation of transition being discussed.

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
234	290	90.23%	100%	85.52%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

Minnesota found slippage on Indicator 8C from the FFY 2021 rate of 90.23% to the FFY 2022 rate of 85.51%. This is a decrease of 4.72%. Of the 290 records that were reviewed in FFY 2022, 234 were found in compliance with this indicator and 14 were found not in compliance due to family reasons. Forty-two records were identified with noncompliance due to district causes in FFY 2022. As noted, this represents overall slippage from FFY 2021 when 156 of the 174 records were found in compliance, one was not in compliance due to family reasons and 17 were not in compliance due to district causes.

MDE attributes the C8c slippage, in part, to the changes in the sampling and data collection methodologies made in FFY 2020. With the revision of its monitoring process, MDE reframed the sampling process and is now specifically sampling children identified as recently exiting Part C services as opposed to a random district sample. Along with revising the sampling process, MDE revised the record review questions being asked of districts in order to better gather the information needed to accurately report on this indicator. MDE believes the revised questions more accurately reflect the intended measurement of this indicator and will allow MDE to better identify specific components of the noncompliance in order to provide more targeted technical assistance; however, MDE is still working on refining the review questions to ensure noncompliance is being accurately identified. MDE also believes the statewide staffing shortages may be contributing to the noncompliance for this indicator. For FFY 2022, MDE sampled a larger number of records and, in turn, identified more noncompliance. MDE continues to work with SEAs and the Early Learning Services Division of MDE to ensure staff understand the requirements related to this indicator and have the supports necessary to meet compliance.

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

14

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

A total of 56 children exiting Part C did not have a transition conference at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday.

Fourteen children had a late transition conference due to exceptional family circumstances or the unavailability of the parent.

40

Accessible format can be found at the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP): 2024 Determination Letters on State Implementation of IDEA

Part C

Sixteen records were cited because the child did not receive a timely transition conference and the IFSP did not include any documentation of transition being discussed. District comments as to why a transition conference was not held include staff error, documentation issues, and unknown reasons.

Twenty-six records indicated the transition conference was not held in the required timeframe.

Four records identified the reason for delay as scheduling issues.

Nineteen records indicated unknown reasons for the delay suggesting the records did not have sufficient detail to determine why the district failed to meet the timeline.

Three records did not include a date of a transition conference or held the conference early.

All of these records included documented steps and services which would suggest a transition conference was held, perhaps as part of the IFSP meeting, but documentation of a date was not evident.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

In FFY 2020, MDE initiated revision of its monitoring process and contracted for development of an online system to conduct an annual statewide record review for indicator data collection, moving away from MDE's Minnesota Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process (MNCIMP) web-based data system, which was determined to be at "end of life" for reliability, and the cyclical monitoring process used in the past, which did not differentiate monitoring based on SEAU needs. MDE completed the record review for FFY 2022 using the new web-based monitoring system, Stepwell MN. The process for FFY 2022 included generating a random statewide sample for each of the indicators. For Indicator 8C, the sample pulled records, based on the most recent statewide enrollment data, from the Minnesota Automated Reporting Student System (MARSS) for children identified as exiting Part C services. Once the sample was finalized, SEAUs were notified and required to complete a review of the record(s) and submit the documentation to MDE. MDE reviewed the documentation submitted and verified a random sample of the reviews. If an SEAU identified noncompliance, MDE sent a formal notification of the noncompliance; the SEAU would need to correct any noncompliance consistent with OSEP QA 23-01.

Data for this indicator are gathered from examining records of children exiting Part C services and determining whether a transition conference was held during the required timeframe for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B. The FFY 2022 data are based on reviews of records from 122 individual districts representing 99 SEAUs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Please see Introduction for additional stakeholder engagement information. Despite not having to set targets for Indicator 8A, 8B, and 8C during engagement in FFY 2021, MDE discussed all three Indicators in the stakeholder and Tribal Nation sessions. Please note that the information included here includes feedback for all three of the Indicator 8 outcomes – they were discussed all together.

Feedback from participants included challenges for families/caregivers as the family-centered Part C shifted to educational needs of the child in Part B. Some of the considerations shared were ensuring families/caregivers understand different expectations for both children and families/caregivers; supporting systems to honor cultures and beliefs in a classroom instead of home environment; and maintaining close relationships with families/caregivers and collaborating with community partners, cultural liaisons, Head Start, and other trusted partners. Participants also shared continued concerns around COVID-19 and the pressing emergencies of workforce.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
16	16	0	0

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

In response to the actions required by OSEP in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, MDE has revised its approach to demonstrating correction of noncompliance to include a subsequent review of additional data for all SEAUs with identified noncompliance and not just those with noncompliance deemed to be systemic or chronic. As part of this revised approach, MDE examined each of the findings of noncompliance from FFY 2021 and reviewed updated data from the SEAU to verify correct implementation of the regulatory requirements. All 16 of the SEAUs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 were asked to review subsequent records in FFY 2022. Those records were chosen randomly from the MARSS system and submitted to MDE via a paper review for regulatory compliance. Submitted documentation confirmed that the SEAUs were correctly implementing the regulatory requirements. MDE has thus reviewed updated data from each of the SEAUs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 and verified that each SEAU is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The data collection for the FFY 2021 record review took place prior to the availability of the Student Level Correction component in Stepwell MN. As a result, MDE used spreadsheets to track all identified noncompliance and verify correction. For the transition conference timeline, when record reviews were completed, the SEAU provided the date the transition conference was held. This allowed MDE to verify that the actions had been completed, although they may have been late. If the transition conference was not held, MDE required the SEAU to verify the successful transition to Part B. If the student was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SEAU, the SEAU would submit to MDE the reason (e.g., student moved) and the date of the occurrence to release the SEAU from further demonstration of correction for that specific student. Based on a review of the data, MDE verified all of the transition conferences had been completed and that each SEAU with noncompliance reflected in the data the State reported for this indicator had completed the transition conference, although late, for any child whose transition conference was identified as not timely unless the child was no longer

within the jurisdiction of the SEAU, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. All correction of individual student record noncompliance was completed within the one-year timeframe.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In response to the actions required by OSEP in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, MDE has revised its approach to demonstrating correction of noncompliance to include a subsequent review of additional data for all SEAUs with identified noncompliance and not just those with noncompliance deemed to be systemic or chronic. MDE verified that all SEAUs with identified noncompliance in FFY 2021 are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements as described in the section "Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements" above. MDE also ensured each individual case of noncompliance has been corrected consistent with OSEP QA 23-01 as described in the section "Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected" above.

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

Minnesota does NOT meet criteria to report for Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions because we do not meet the requirements for number of resolution sessions during the reporting year.

While this indicator is NOT APPLICABLE to Minnesota, we would like to share that we continue discussion and in-reach about Indicator 9 along with Indicator 10: Mediation with stakeholders. We also intentionally focused American Rescue Plan Act (ARP) funds subgrants for Family Engagement. Family Engagement grant recipients focused on why families sometimes choose additional options and not Part C services when their children are referred. While we are still digging into the sub-granting data, we believe what we are learning will help better support how we ensure each and every family in Minnesota and the 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us are served in ways that align with their families' cultures, values, and wants for their children. Based on our state's graduation rates demographic data for the last 6 years, we have much work to do across the systems to do better for Black, Indigenous, and Children and Families/Caregivers of Color, as well as families/caregivers who use Heritage languages as their home languages. Part C is the beginning into education for children and families/caregivers in Minnesota at the intersection of race, language, and dis/ability. How are we really doing with supporting parents in their rights when many parents may not even believe they have rights, such as parents who are undocumented? In addition, are we educating families/caregivers about advocacy in ways that support their cultures, traditions, ways of information-sharing, or are we expecting them to fit into the dominant culture mold? Once again, we do not meet criteria to report Indicator 9, but we see this indicator's intent in Minnesota with a clearer understanding. We are dedicated to continuing our learning from families and caregivers how we can best support their and their children's needs.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

9 - Required Actions

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $[(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1] \text{ times } 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under Section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/15/2023	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Minnesota does NOT meet criteria to report for Indicator 10: Mediation.

While this indicator is NOT APPLICABLE to Minnesota, we would like to share that we continue discussion and in-reach about Indicator 10 along with Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions with stakeholders. We also intentionally focused American Rescue Plan Act (ARP) funds subgrants for Family Engagement. Family Engagement grant recipients focused on why families sometimes choose additional options and not Part C services when their children are referred. While we are still digging into the sub-granting data, we believe what we are learning will help better support how we ensure each and every family in Minnesota and the 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us are served in ways that align with their families' cultures, values, and wants for their children. Based on our state's graduation rates demographic data for the last 6 years, we have much work to do across the systems to do better for Black, Indigenous, and Children and Families/Caregivers of Color, as well as families/caregivers who use Heritage languages as their home languages. Part C is the beginning into education for children and families/caregivers in Minnesota at the intersection of race, language, and dis/ability. How are we really doing with supporting parents in their rights when many parents may not even believe they have rights, such as parents who are undocumented? In addition, are we educating families/caregivers about advocacy in ways that support their cultures, traditions, ways of information-sharing, or are we expecting them to fit into the dominant culture mold? Once again, we do not meet criteria to report Indicator 10, but we see this indicator's intent in Minnesota with a clearer understanding. We are dedicated to continuing our learning from families and caregivers how we can best support their and their children's needs.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=				

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

n/a

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 11. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

11 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Infants, toddlers, and preschool children with dis/abilities will substantially increase their rate of growth in the acquisition and use of knowledge and skills by the time they exit Part C or transition to kindergarten.

All local programs will contribute data to Minnesota's performance toward achieving the established targets.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subpopulation of children is limited to:

- a) infants and toddlers who enter or exit Part C below age expectations in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language and communication, and;
- b) preschool-aged children who enter or exit 619 below age expectations in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills including early language, literacy and communication

In both situations, students must have been in service for at least 6 months to report an exit score.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=PROD058346&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

YES

Historical Data

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2018	55.80%
B	2018	67.84%

Targets

FFY	Current Relationship	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	60.10%	60.20%	60.30%	60.40%
Target B	Data must be greater than or equal to the target	67.10%	67.90%	68.70%	69.50%

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Part	# of infants and toddlers/preschoolers	# of infants and toddlers/preschoolers	FFY 2021 Data	FFY 2022 Target	FFY 2022 Data	Status	Slippage
------	--	--	---------------	-----------------	---------------	--------	----------

	reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)	reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d)					
A	1,691	2,959	55.79%	60.10%	57.15%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B	2,809	4,591	64.93%	67.10%	61.18%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for B slippage, if applicable

Minnesota Department of Education has continued to monitor the outcomes of children and families as we move out of the Covid-19 pandemic. In 2020, the average number of months that students were in service was 19.5 months. During the Covid-19 pandemic, we saw this drop to 17 months in 2021 and have seen another minor drop to 16.5 months in service in 2022. With this data, we have also seen the percentage of children that are showing no improvement in skills significant enough to demonstrate progress in rating over the period they were receiving services has increased 5.5% for outcome A. Additionally, we see that 3% less students improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

Minnesota's process allows local programs to use a variety of sources to inform the ratings on each Child Outcome Summary form. Teams may use information from norm-referenced tools administered as part of a child's initial evaluation. They may also use caregiver report and professional observation to complete an age-anchored criterion-referenced assessment tool. Minnesota's process requires careful use of the cross-walk documents developed by the Early Childhood Outcome Center. Minnesota requires ratings be made within a month of the actual date of entry or exit. This year, Minnesota has changed the process of COS exit C and entry at the point of transition. There is now an opportunity for local level decisions about the appropriateness of the use of a Part C exit rating as the Part B entry rating. As local agencies were completing their rating submissions, they were given an opportunity to pull in the exit rating from part C exit reporting or enter a new entry rating for Part B.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Exit reporting occurs each November for the previous school year collection of students entering and exiting both Part B and Part C programs during that year. SEAU's are provided a list of students that the MDE has generated based on student enrollment information that has been reported. These lists are broken into each entrance and exit collection. Districts are able to load their data via spreadsheet uploads, manual input, or through the submission of item level assessment data in the case of Part B/619. During the course of reporting, MDE staff monitor closely for incomplete submissions and "spot" check for validity for those scores generated through item level assessment procedures. Data is then pulled into Tableau® server and coded to create dashboards for analysis. Once the data is within the Tableau® dashboards created by our early learning services data manager/analyst, we can disaggregate data in a variety of means (race, region, type of district, dis/ability category and setting) and through secure reporting are able to "turn around" reports to local SEAU's for their use at the local level.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.

High-quality data collection, reporting and use is a critical component of our Theory of Action.

Previously identified, the shift to item-level assessment data submission for calculating Child Outcomes has definitely impacted overall performance for all three outcomes of indicator 3, questions 1 and 2 i for Part B/619. The most impacted of the three areas has been in acquisition of knowledge and skills. In further analysis, the MDE ECSE team along with the coordinator of our early learning services assessment program had discovered some potential impacts to data that were unintentional in effect. Over the last year, our team has clarified the formulas and logic models for our data collection and analysis of COS outcomes, most notably correcting cross-walk between Kindergarten Entry Profile (KEP) tools and Early Childhood Indicators of Progress (ECIPs) and how those components intersect with child outcome ratings to determine if there are any pieces of this system that need to be edited. We will not be moving forward with item-level submission of data for children participating in Part C services and are further exploring the separation of exit C Child Outcomes Summary (COS) from entrance B COS. We are finding that there are greater discrepancies of outcome scores between student's entrance and exit based on how the score was calculated. We have also learned from the field through our listening sessions that determining a new entrance to B score is critical when there is a period of time between a child's exit from Part C and the initiation of Part B services that follow a school year calendar. We know that children may demonstrate the need for increased supports when participating in a new environment with unfamiliar adults, like preschool. For some children, the transition to these new environments and people may impact their ability to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in the short term. Additionally, we have noted a considerable shift of our COS data in terms of the data quality checker that makes it evident that we need to provide extensive training around the COS rating determination process. Given that the responsibility for facilitating the Child Outcomes Summary rating process typically falls on the practitioners working with children and families, it is of note that they report difficulty understanding the usefulness of COS ratings. Numerous practitioners have shared during listening sessions that COS ratings do not provide data that can be used in real time to adjust programming for individual students, and that the ratings often feel like an additional administrative task that is informed by other data they are already responsible for collecting and reporting through the IFSP/IEP process or to their district. This is a barrier to the "buy in" that is necessary for practitioners to meaningfully engage in any technical assistance that is offered around the COS rating process. To that end,

we also recognize that our efforts must address an improved utility for local use to inform program improvement, as well as assessment of our current procedures: timelines for collection, exit and entrance collection points, and data literacy supports for program leaders.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection.

Yes. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted the already stretched workforce of the early intervention and early childhood special education programs across the state. In speaking with several of our local education program providers, we are learning that the impact of workforce shortages and turn-over that has been further exacerbated by the pandemic has resulted in difficulties with training and then time necessary to ensure quality assessment practice.

The Minnesota Department of Education's Early Childhood Special Education Team is working to establish training materials that can be accessed asynchronously for leaders to utilize with onboarding new staff. Additionally, MDE has been providing leaders and practitioners with technical assistance around efficiencies that can be maximized while still meeting requirements of IDEA. MDE also worked closely with districts on identifying the students appropriate for collection, ensuring accuracy of reporting, and providing "in-time" support when we have identified issues in the data.

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=PROD058346&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period.

1. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to further developing sustainable and equitable professional development inclusive of practitioners and early childhood leaders that will be responsively developed and supported in order to meet local level programs where they're at while striving to improve practices implemented with fidelity.
2. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to ensuring that Special Education Administrative Unit (SEAU) level administrators, schools boards and early childhood leaders have access to the technical assistance and professional development to ensure their capacity and understanding of programs and services necessary to support early learning programs inclusive of workforce, fiscal, program design and quality, data informed decision making, and oversight.
3. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to a system that prioritizes family, caregiver, and community partnerships and ongoing feedback loops at the state and local levels focused on meeting family, caregiver, and community identified needs.
4. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to ensuring that data collected and data used are reliable, valid and useful at the state and local levels to inform program improvement and ongoing needs assessment as well as data literacy for program leaders and practitioners.
5. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to improvement of early intervention/early child special education resources and services available through implementation of high quality, trauma informed best practices and culturally responsive programs.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

As referenced above by number, these outcomes are directly tied to sharing during ongoing in-reach across Minnesota and 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us during FFY 2020-2022. While each and every child and caregiver will benefit from both sharing and actions, our intentional focus continues to be American Indian children and caregivers and families historically and currently made to be most marginalized by our systems.

1. Commitment to further developing sustainable and equitable professional development for practitioners/early childhood leaders:
 - a. The ECSE team ensured materials, resources, and assistance was readily accessible across the state through timely responses, engaging virtual calls, and monthly regional in-person visits. These opportunities prioritized ongoing, purposeful feedback loops.
 - b. Our CSPD Recruitment and Retention continue to use the data gathered through the comprehensive survey process identifying reasons educators leave the profession and recommendations for culturally responsive retention implementation. CSPD Personnel Standards and PELSB led pivotal work for the adoption of national ECSE standards in Minnesota.
 - c. Our Due Process, Standards Aligned IEPs, and Hard Conversations in Early Childhood webinars continued to be accessed throughout the state. Live virtual technical assistance sessions were available per request. Collaborations with general education partners supported programs with variation in rules, regulations, and policies and addressed transitions to Kindergarten through the Successful Learner Equation (<https://education.mn.gov/MDE/dse/early/highquality/kt/sl/index.htm>), reminding us it is not the responsibility of the child to be "ready" for school. It is the responsibility of systems, adults, schools/programs, environments, and communities to be ready to support each child.
 - d. Growth in understanding of access to innovations led to designing new evidence-based materials, along with implementation guides, which will be readily available and accessible for programs across the state.
2. Commitment to ensuring that SEAU administrators, schools boards and leaders understand programs and services:
 - a. We continued to provide a leader series for onboarding ECSE leaders in their first years and "timely topics" provided at monthly leadership calls for "just in time" information and TA.
 - b. We began a series for executive level leadership around competencies in early education programs.

3. Commitment to a system that prioritizes ongoing family, caregiver, and community partnerships and feedback loops for authentic engagement – listening to understand:

a. We completed grants made possible through ARP funds with four local entities focused on understanding caregivers' experiences around Part C: experiences of caregivers and providers working in rural areas, Somali communities and the stigmatization of Autism, learning why parents decide to decline services, and how children and caregivers experience early intervention through diverse cultures and languages. Each of the grantees ensured as part of their grant awards direct connections to the communities of their foci through staff, family and caregiver connectors, and/or community partners.

b. 22 Part C programs completed ARP funded grants for focus projects responding to COVID and intersectionalities. Many of these projects focused on understanding experiences of those receiving services to increase the knowledge, skills, and capacities of service providers; identifying barriers to accessing programs and services; and ensuring knowledge gaps are filled and skills are built.

c. Our redesign of Minnesota's Family Outcomes Survey is fully underway through intensive TA with ECTA and DaSy, as well as a contract with the Wilder Foundation to redesign the survey and process. Engagement continues to show current survey questions hold little actionable data for LEAs for improvement cycles and are not culturally supportive, meaningful, or well understood among caregivers. An electronic procedure began piloting Spring 2023 with several districts across the state. The opportunity for caregivers to self-select demographic identifiers as part of the survey such as Tribal Nation, race, ethnicity, and Heritage language is significant.

4. Commitment to ensuring that data collected and used are reliable, valid and useful, including increasing data literacy:

a. Several workshops were available to local leaders over the past 12 months. Several districts requested support with individual sessions addressing questions about funding, interpreting outcomes data, analyzing forecasting trends, and program development decisions.

b. Minnesota is refining tools and processes for collecting data and information, ensuring data is valid and reliable through rigorous qualitative analysis and logic model development; and building detailed, historical data dashboards for LEAs to access, analyze, and track data trends over time.

5. Commitment to the improvement of resources and services available around trauma and racism for children, families/caregivers and their EI/ECSE providers:

a. The Preschool Development Grant and MDE provided learning in trauma-centered communities of practice (CoPs). The CoP's focused on awareness and understanding of trauma's impact and how it affects behavior of adults and children. Also included was emphasis on self-care for providers.

b. Part C ARP funds supported a contract with Dr. Rosemarie Allen for facilitation of a local programs equity audit. The contract includes training for the MDE ECSE team, PDFs and members of the IEICs on the 5 stages of anti-bias work: personal, interpersonal, institutional, community, and system; and we intend will lead to the development of asynchronous learning modules, reflective practice guides, equity audits for PDFs to support at the local level, and recommendations for further work and advancement of equity in Part C and 619 programs.

c. Part C funds are continuing to support a contract in Trauma Informed/Responsive practices that began with Part C ARP Funds. This contract has been awarded and work began in April 2023. This contract includes professional development, reflective practice guides, implementation frameworks, and modules for asynchronous learning.

d. In-reach-led updates to our intake and referral system are underway, including translation of forms in our Help Me Grow system supporting referrals made in Heritage languages which are set to post live in February 2024, as well as a phone line where families access information in their Heritage language prior to live connection also in their Heritage language through interpreters. The updates to language on the Help Me Grow website that reflects prior and on-going in-reach with families, caregivers, and community partners is underway. The experiential family/caregiver videos which were developed from perspectives of diverse cultures to support referral processes for children and families/caregivers from these communities into early intervention supports continue to be a top google analytics topic of searches on the Help Me Grow Minnesota website (<https://www.helpmegrowmn.org/HMG/HelpfulRes/ParentStories/index.html>).

e. The Regional IEIC Teams have been participating in a year-long training process around equity at all levels to increase their personal and system-level understanding and implementation of work plans for better reaching families, communities, and additional referring partners in culturally supportive ways, and to more fully support connections for children and families with the early childhood special education programs in meaningful and culturally competent ways.

f. In efforts to better coordinate systems and programming for families/caregivers participating in Part C and Part B, the ECSE Team also continues focus on collaborating with early childhood partners. Refer to the Introduction for a list of ways this is on-going.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

1. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is developing sustainable and equitable professional development inclusive of practitioners and early childhood leaders. The MDE ECSE team in coordination with the PDFs will supplement the use of innovations with the creation of webinars, implementation supports, and reflective practice guides. Even more, with the work being done on increasing our capacity in trauma-healing practices and implicit bias, we will further support the incorporation of these practices into all other learning modules and trainings.

2. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to ensuring that Special Education Administrative Unit (SEAU) level administrators and early childhood leaders have access to the technical assistance and professional development to ensure their capacity and understanding of programs and services necessary to support early learning programs inclusive of workforce, fiscal, program design and quality, data informed decision making, and oversight and will continue this work by turning individual program supports into supports readily available webinars and supporting documents. Additionally, we will continue to explore ways for leaders across the state to have support in learning how to facilitate implementation and sustainability while managing adaptive challenges associated with funding and workforce.

3. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to a system that prioritizes family, caregiver, and community partnerships and ongoing feedback loops at the state and local levels focused on meeting family, caregiver and community identified needs and will continue this work in the following ways:

--The redesign of the Family Outcome Survey and its process will support the needs of families/caregivers in having multiple methods to engage in providing feedback and in the answering of questions that are relevant, understood across cultures and meaningful to their experiences. The opportunity to provide quality family/caregiver feedback to the districts supporting children and families/caregivers through early intervention services will also be a critical feedback loop component.

--The outcomes of our Family Engagement Grants and district grant recipients will be provided at fiscal year-end, including recommendations for state and local programs to take action.

--Additionally, the IEICs and the ICC will also review the feedback and recommendations from the considerable engagement on how best to proceed in meeting the needs of the Part C early intervention families and systems of supports as we transition to the Department of Children, Youth and Families

(DCYF) projected on July 1, 2024..

4. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to ensuring that data collected and data used are reliable, valid and useful at the state and local levels to inform program improvement and ongoing needs assessment as well as data literacy for program leaders and practitioners and will supported in the following ways in the coming year:

--The design and development of a historically capable dashboard of child outcomes that districts will be able to access. These dashboards will allow for the opportunity for districts to look at trends, demographic specific outcomes inclusive of race, language, and dis/ability.

--The creation and posting of fiscal revenue and expenditure reports that are specific to early childhood special education and early intervention programs as well as guides for analyzing and supporting practices and program design.

--Lastly, we will explore opportunities to improve the data that we have related to our early childhood workforce as it relates to our early intervention and early childhood special education programs across the state. Currently, we have limited data related to the related services providers.

5. Minnesota Part C and Part B/619 SEA is committed to improvement of resources and services available to early intervention/early child special education children and caregivers through implementation of high quality, trauma-informed best practices, and culturally responsive programs that will be supported in the following ways in the coming year:

--Over the course of the next year, the contracts related to Implicit Bias and Trauma-Healing practices will begin to result in modules for asynchronous learning, significant training and support for professional development facilitators as well as engagement to inform the development of content to be contextualized in implementation and reflective practice guides.

--Additionally, through collaborations with partners in the departments of health and human services, we will work to ensure that mechanisms supported by these agencies to provide quality mental health supports and services to young children are linked to local providers and referral sources.

List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period:

Our robust improvement plan continues to promote four distinct sets of evidence-based or evidence-informed practices that were chosen to support practitioners in our 0-5 system who work in homes, classrooms, or who support eligible young children itinerantly: Evidence-based Quality Intervention Practices (EQIP); The Pyramid Model; The Classroom Engagement Model (CEM); Practice-Based Coaching.

With the creation of practices modules and implementation guides, more district and cooperative programs will be able to engage in the materials and supports that best meet their program needs at the time, while also having the support of professional development facilitators for the implementation and sustainability of practices.

Detailed information about the implementation of these four bundles of practices will be provided during our discussion of progress made on the activities. Information on the innovations can also be accessed on the Minnesota Centers of Excellence website (www.mncoe.org). Additionally, the evidence-based practice of Practice-Based Coaching is incorporated throughout implementation of every innovation practice.

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

Evidence-based Quality Intervention Practices (EQIP): EQIP is a MNCoe innovation that supports early interventionists to learn and implement Family Centered Practices within Natural Learning Environments, using a Coaching Interaction Style. The essential elements include, Coaching Interaction Practices, characteristics of coaching, building family/caregiver capacity; Natural Learning Environment Practices, using everyday settings as sources of learning, child interest in learning; Family/Caregiver-Centered Practices, culturally responsive practices; Relationship-Based Practices, teaming and collaboration strategies for implementing the primary coach approach, joint visits.

Pyramid Model: Pyramid Model is a framework for supporting social competence and preventing challenging behavior in young children, particularly those with or at risk for delays or dis/abilities. The model emphasizes building positive relationships with children and families/caregivers, creating supportive environments, intentionally teaching social skills and individualizing interventions when needed. The goal of the Pyramid Model Partnership is to plan, implement and sustain a cross-sector professional development system in order to enhance the knowledge and skills of practitioners in meeting the social-emotional needs of young children in inclusive and natural environments. Data-driven decision-making is used to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional approaches and implementation of the model to fidelity.

The Classroom Engagement Model (CEM): The Classroom Engagement Model (CEM) is a set of research-based teaching practices that increase engagement and full participation of each and every child. Increased engagement leads to more learning, increased skill acquisition, and better outcomes for children. The overarching principles are focused on engagement, independence and social relationships through strong partnerships between general and special education partnerships. These outcomes align to the Child Outcome Summary (COS) used in Early Childhood Special Education to summarize a child's functioning in everyday living across developmental domains to support local, state and federal organizations to make data based decisions on continuous improvement.

Practice-Based Coaching: Practice-Based Coaching is a model of coaching that includes three components which are associated with change in mentees' practices and associated changes in child outcomes. Each of the components occurs within the context of collaborative partnerships. Component 1: shared goals and action planning involves identifying priorities and then activities and resources to meet those goals. It is essentially a roadmap for support and feedback and ongoing monitoring of outcomes; Component 2: Engaging in Focused Observations with observation referring to the process of gathering and recording information about the desired effective practices during ongoing activities, routines and transitions; Component 3: Reflecting on and Sharing Feedback involves taking time to think about what was effective and what was a barrier to improving or refining implementation of practices.

During FFY 2022 we continued to target discretionary federal funds to support local programs implementing one of the evidence-based interventions. We shifted the allocation process to needs-based budget proposals while ensuring more equitable access to districts across Greater Minnesota and school cooperatives who historically have had less capacity to apply for this funding. In the next phase of our Personnel Development plan, we plan to build out additional engagement and support opportunities that meet districts where they're at in the identification of barriers to implementing best practices, as well as needs and capacity with implementation science. This will include programs serving American Indian families/caregivers on and off Tribal Nation lands and many additional growing communities.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practices and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child/outcomes.

EQIP is a package of evidence-based practices that are known to have specific impacts to child outcomes. When parents/caregivers are well supported to practice and support the needs of their child throughout daily routines, improved outcomes in all domains will occur.

The Pyramid Model has been tested in multiple research projects and has shown evidence for promoting young children's social and emotional skills and decreasing child challenging behavior. These evidence-based practices were focused on identifying those practices that would: 1) Promote the social and emotional outcomes of all children; 2) promote the skill development of children with social, emotional, and behavioral delays to prevent the need for more intensive supports; and 3) intervene effectively when children have persistent challenging behavior.

The Classroom Engagement Model (CEM) is a set of research-based teaching practices that increase engagement and full participation of every child. Increased engagement leads to more learning, increased skill acquisition, and better outcomes for children. CEM focuses on teaching children within daily routines, alongside their peers, and with materials or activities that children are interested in. Additionally, children with dis/abilities are at-risk for lower levels of engagement and often need additional opportunities to practice new skills. Focusing on strategies to increase engagement and active participation leads to better outcomes for all children.

Practice-Based Coaching: Studies have shown that practice-based coaching activities have a positive impact on desired teaching practices including curricular implementation, behavior support practices, improved child-teacher interactions and overall changes to a teacher's attitude about teaching practices. Components of practice-based coaching are also associated with positive child outcomes including: increased participation and engagement, increased social skills, and increased knowledge and skills.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

In August 2020, MNCoE launched Minnesota Innovation Implementation Data (MIID), a web-based data system for local programs to enter data and generate meaningful reports in real time, to all participating sites statewide. MNCoE and MDE in partnership with MNIT Services (Minnesota's state technology center), created the MIID system to replace the more cumbersome data collection efforts through paper logs and excel spreadsheets. The online system provides local teams instant access to data summaries that can be used to make decisions and improve practices in the implementation of their selected innovation.

Within the online data collection and reporting system, programs that are participating in innovations record coaching log data, fidelity tool data for each specific innovation, and benchmarks of quality that have been established for each innovation.

The MIID system has been appreciated by innovation sites for fidelity of implementation monitoring. Statewide data reports demonstrate that growth in implementation with fidelity is evident across all of the innovations. COVID-19 had considerable impact on districts as a whole. There were several districts that put their innovation work on hold, others that managed to maintain engagement, and still a few others that cancelled their contracts. Of significance, however, is that EQIP demonstrated the least amount of impact likely due to the ability to translate these tools in a virtual platform. Our state implementation teams and local leaders have demonstrated commitment to ensure that progress continues and that district teams have the support and resources necessary to meet their program implementation goals whether through innovation engagement or foundational and operational supports.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

With each of the evidence-based practice innovation (EQIP, Pyramid, and CEM), considerable effort has been made to ensure that fidelity of implementation is paramount. With data collection requirements that are part of the joint powers agreement process (state contracts with each district to support the initial installation of evidence-based practices), we have been able to determine that the frameworks of active implementation components have been successful in building internal capacity within districts and long term sustainability. Through stakeholder engagement, the consensus became that the only way to ensure scalability of these practices was to allow for engagement that has a tiered progression of training, an opportunity to address staff turn-over through readily accessible trainings offered virtually and asynchronously, and that location and size of SEAU were not prohibitive. MDE, along with MNCoE, have begun the work of developing different means to access high quality supports that support the capacity and needs of individual programs while working to support implementation.

When implementing high quality, evidence-based practices in programs, it would be expected that student outcomes improve over time. Directly correlating child outcomes to implementation of practices would not be a reasonable connection to make given that lack of control of variables is impacting the work and data collections. However, due to the favorable outcomes at the local level on staff efficacy and culture, as well as the potential for significant systems improvement, stakeholders indicated a strong desire to continue innovations AND ensure more equitable access for broader implementation.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

For EQIP, CEM and Pyramid Innovations, the following commitments remain to carry over to this next 12 month period for the MNCoE in collaboration with the MDE:

- A) The use of ARP funds to build a scalable and sustainable professional development and implementation guide for EQIP foundational practices, which has begun.
- B) Offering engagement opportunities with the practices of each of the three Innovations (EQIP, CEM and Pyramid) that will afford more districts to engage outside of joint powers agreements with the MDE for financial support. This allows for high quality best practices supports and resources for implementation and sustainable planning at the local level to scale up across the state. In addition, with the creation of asynchronous modules, partners in the care and education of young children with dis/abilities will have greater access to high quality professional development opportunities.
- C) Through the use of evidence-based practices, we will equip the work force with the tools, materials, and strategies necessary to provide high quality care and education opportunities for children with dis/abilities as well as improve job satisfaction (as indicated through retention surveys as a key in supporting the work force).

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.

MDE has not made any changes to the activities and strategies or timelines described in the previous submission. Our logic models and theory of action remain relevant and supportive of the continuation of our work plans because they were completely determined through the intensive engagement and in-reach described in both last year's SPP/APR submission and this year's. MDE remains committed to continuous engagement and feedback loop opportunities as a means to being responsive, collaborative, and supportive of the needs of children, families, caregivers, and the professionals that serve them. At this time, continued engagement and work plan actions align fully with our SSIP as we transition to the new Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) set for July 1, 2024.

Please find our Comprehensive System of Personnel Development Logic Model at:

https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=PROD058347&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary

Please find our EI/ECSE Operations and Implementation Logic Model at:

https://education.mn.gov/mdeprod/idcplg?IdcService=GET_FILE&dDocName=PROD058348&RevisionSelectionMethod=latestReleased&Rendition=primary

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input around Minnesota's Indicator 11/SSIP for FFY 2022 was intricately intertwined with the in-reach described in this year's Introduction as well as each individual Indicator. As shared in the Introduction, this past year has been a reflective time of in-reach, action, and building of feedback loop processes, significantly met through the four Family Engagement grants made possible from receiving Part C American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act funds. These grants allowed for extensive family and caregiver input in historical ways for Minnesota's Part C program. The grants ended September 30, 2023, and we are currently deep in an analyzation process as we prepare for sharing out the stories families gave us as meaningful data that impacts every part of our Part C and early childhood systems across Minnesota and 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us. This is critical timing as we are now preparing for transition to a new lead agency at the Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) set for July 1, 2024. The grantees have been meeting with the ECSE Team to further analyze and prepare ways the comprehensive information shared by families and caregivers can be fully received by providers and professionals leading to better services for children, families, and each other.

In addition, Minnesota's ECSE Team continued our dedication this past year to in-reach at every opportunity through a variety of informal listening sessions, ECSE Leadership calls, DCYF listening opportunities, workgroup participation, Open Office Hours, CSPD work, and ICC and IEIC meetings. We continued gathering and sharing out through various methods of data capturing, such as large and small group discussions, use of virtual and anonymous polls like Mentimeter and Ideaboardz, and active in-reach through the Part C ARP funds Family Engagement and District/Cooperative grants.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Minnesota's SSIP and development of the current Theory of Action and subsequent logic models were completely driven and determined by stakeholder engagement. As we continued action on our SSIP this past year, we continued our dedication to the activities happening to support our SSIP being developed by and for the people most impacted by the SSIP actions. The focus this past year for engagement and in-reach has been around families, caregivers, community partners and family/caregiver liaisons, providers, program leaders, our ICC membership, our regional IEIC teams responsible for public awareness and outreach, and our CSPD workgroup and leadership teams. In addition, our Core Stakeholder Group continues participating in in-reach as needed. Families and caregivers are a direct part of the work through each of these entities, in addition to providing their unique input through our Part C American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act funds Family Engagement grants. All those engaged this past year in our key improvement efforts have helped streamline priorities, review progress, create new synthezation of data and themes, and brainstorm action plans and strategies that will now lead us into the lead agency transition and beyond.

In addition, the ICC and the IEICs continued regular interactive meetings and support the work of the SSIP through consistent advisement, assistance, and implementation across all areas. The ICC and IEICs have also continued focusing on systems, policy, and programming level changes through equity foundations going on four years. This work has been grounded through embracing the components of an Intentional Container as developed by Open Source Leadership Strategies (<https://opensourceleadership.com/>), tying all work to the Ten Commitments to Equity as redeveloped at the Minnesota Department of Education (found on the Minnesota Commissioner of Education's webpage: <https://education.mn.gov/MDE/about/cms/h/>), and working to recognize and decolonize the components of white supremacy throughout our systems and implementation actions as described by Tema Okun (<https://www.whitesupremacyculture.info/>) while simultaneously embracing additional creative ways to be in this work for children, families, caregivers, and each other that are inspired by the communities we live within.

ECSE Leadership monthly engagement through regularly scheduled statewide calls with the ECSE Team continued to keep information flow consistent to and from all districts. Various ECSE Team members attended Special Education director forums, Regional Low Incidence Facilitator meetings, weekly Dream Catcher groups, and other stakeholder opportunities to maximize information gathering and giving. The CSPD workgroups have met monthly to engage in their work on a consistent and efficacious level, therefore advancing this work in critical ways that support Minnesota's SSIP, Theory of Action, and logic models in action including recommendations for adopting national early intervention standards, which are now implemented in Minnesota. All levels of engagement this past year have included surveys, polls, and work groups to capture information shared, discussed, and leading the way with Minnesota's cycles of action for infants, toddlers, young children, families, caregivers, communities, and each other. Please see the Introduction for additional information about engagement and in-reach.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

A predominant theme throughout engagement and across the representative participants continues to be workforce issues (e.g. lack of professionals trained and ready, lack of programs available, lack of awareness of the profession, as well as retention of current and over-burdened employees). A significant part of workforce concerns that came through strong this year is ensuring the workforce in Minnesota, currently predominantly white and female, matches our diverse population and comes from Native Communities and Communities of Color and those using diverse Heritage languages to better serve our families/caregivers historically and currently underserved in Minnesota's Part C programs. While we work to diversify our workforce, we also heard this past year across every region of our state the need for current majority-white providers to continue with supports in addressing implicit bias and with learning how to better support children and families/caregivers experiencing trauma. Additionally, themes of the rapidly changing demographics of children and families/caregivers and increased complexity of needs in the area of mental health and resource scarcity continue.

Another theme that continues centers the concerns around a leadership force responsible for supporting early learning programs while having minimal capacity in program implementation, best practices, and professional needs. A final and critical theme that continues with strength and need is the focus on equity for infants, toddlers, and families/caregivers in Minnesota and 11 Tribal Nations who share land with us who have been historically and are currently made to be most marginalized, and the tie between early childhood and graduation rates for each and every child in Minnesota and all Tribal Nations represented on and off Tribal Nations lands.

In addition, we are in the process of analyzing the concerns shared by families and caregivers through the ARP Act funds Family Engagement grants from this past year. Results and actions taken will be included in Minnesota's SPP/APR FFY 2023.

The concerns shared this past year align with our SSIP theory of action and logic models already in place. Our CSPD efforts have expanded to include intentional in-reach with current Providers of Color. We also have a significant contract in action that began with our Part C ARP Funds in partnership with Dr. Rosemarie Allen through which we have developed a flexible equity audit to assist district and cooperative programs and the regional IECs in "taking temperatures" of where strengths and needs are in equity work to help guide growth and learning for action and better support of children and families experiencing Part C services, as well as better supporting referring providers and families/caregivers. As part of this contract, Minnesota's Professional Development Facilitators, Regional Low Incidence Facilitators (RLIFs), and leaders from the regional IEC teams have been participating in a 16-month deep training focusing on racial equity and additional intersectionalities from internal learning all the way through systems-level work. The contract with Dr. Allen and her team is also supporting development of a new system of professional supports and asynchronous learning around implicit bias and healing-informed strategies for all early childhood providers who support Part C children and families/caregivers, which is still in process. We have ECSE staff involved in a mentorship program through the Minnesota Department of Education as beginning steps to support our ECSE leaders in new ways, and we are actively engaged through various interagency efforts to address the racial, economic, and geographical inequities that continue to afflict our graduation rates at alarming levels for American Indian students, Black students, Latine students, students using Heritage languages, students experiencing poverty, and our students with dis/abilities. Much of this work is aligned with projects happening through our Preschool Development Grant and the strategic plan for our Early Learning Services division. The ECSE Team continues to look for ways to be in the cycles of change addressing the concerns of those engaged in our work who are most affected by our work.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

While this is not an activity related to our SiMR directly, it is significant to note that the lead agency for our Part C program is projected to shift to a new, statutorily created agency called the Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF) on July 1, 2024. Information about this agency development can be found at this website: <https://mn.gov/mmb/dcyf-implementation/>

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

This change is set to happen on July 1, 2024 as of the writing of the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

n/a

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

n/a

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Danielle Hayden

Title:

Supervisor, Early Childhood Special Education

Email:

danielle.hayden@state.mn.us

Phone:

1-651-582-8473

Submitted on:

04/19/24 10:18:53 AM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

Minnesota

2024 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

Percentage (%)	Determination
75.00%	Needs Assistance

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

Section	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
Results	8	5	62.50%
Compliance	16	14	87.50%

2024 Part C Results Matrix

I. Data Quality

(a) Data Completeness: The percent of children included in your State's 2021 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Number of Children Reported in Indicator C3 (i.e., outcome data)	3,398
Number of Children Reported Exiting in 618 Data (i.e., 618 exiting data)	5,792
Percentage of Children Exiting who are Included in Outcome Data (%)	58.67
Data Completeness Score (please see Appendix A for a detailed description of this calculation)	1

(b) Data Anomalies: Anomalies in your State's FFY 2021 Outcomes Data

Data Anomalies Score (please see Appendix B for a detailed description of this calculation)	2
--	---

II. Child Performance

(a) Data Comparison: Comparing your State's 2022 Outcomes Data to other States' 2022 Outcomes Data

Data Comparison Score (please see Appendix C for a detailed description of this calculation)	1
---	---

(b) Performance Change Over Time: Comparing your State's FFY 2022 data to your State's FFY 2021 data

Performance Change Score (please see Appendix D for a detailed description of this calculation)	1
--	---

Summary Statement Performance	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1 (%)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1 (%)	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS1 (%)	Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS2 (%)
FFY 2022	51.84%	47.12%	57.22%	40.04%	55.72%	47.74%
FFY 2021	49.88%	47.49%	55.79%	40.52%	56.27%	48.90%

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2024: Part C."

2024 Part C Compliance Matrix

Part C Compliance Indicator (2)	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (3)	Score
Indicator 1: Timely service provision	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 7: 45-day timeline	89.55%	YES	2
Indicator 8A: Timely transition plan	80.34%	YES	1
Indicator 8B: Transition notification	100.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 8C: Timely transition conference	85.52%	YES	1
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	100.00%		2
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Programmatic Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:

https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-C_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for an indicator.

Appendix A

I. (a) Data Completeness:

The Percent of Children Included in your State's 2022 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes Data (C3) and the total number of children your State reported in its FFY 2022 IDEA Section 618 data. A percentage for your State was computed by dividing the number of children reported in your State's Indicator C3 data by the number of children your State reported exited during FFY 2022 in the State's FFY 2022 IDEA Section 618 Exit Data.

Data Completeness Score	Percent of Part C Children included in Outcomes Data (C3) and 618 Data
0	Lower than 34%
1	34% through 64%
2	65% and above

Appendix B

I. (b) Data Quality:

Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes Data

This score represents a summary of the data anomalies in the FFY 2022 Indicator 3 Outcomes Data reported by your State. Publicly available data for the preceding four years reported by and across all States for each of 15 progress categories under Indicator 3 (in the FFY 2018 – FFY 2021 APRs) were used to determine an expected range of responses for each progress category under Outcomes A, B, and C. For each of the 15 progress categories, a mean was calculated using the publicly available data and a lower and upper scoring percentage was set 1 standard deviation above and below the mean for category a, and 2 standard deviations above and below the mean for categories b through e (numbers are shown as rounded for display purposes, and values are based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters). In any case where the low scoring percentage set from 1 or 2 standard deviations below the mean resulted in a negative number, the low scoring percentage is equal to 0.

If your State's FFY 2022 data reported in a progress category fell below the calculated "low percentage" or above the "high percentage" for that progress category for all States, the data in that particular category are statistically improbable outliers and considered an anomaly for that progress category. If your State's data in a particular progress category was identified as an anomaly, the State received a 0 for that category. A percentage that is equal to or between the low percentage and high percentage for each progress category received 1 point. A State could receive a total number of points between 0 and 15. Thus, a point total of 0 indicates that all 15 progress categories contained data anomalies and a point total of 15 indicates that there were no data anomalies in all 15 progress categories in the State's data. An overall data anomaly score of 0, 1, or 2 is based on the total points awarded.

Outcome A	Positive Social Relationships
Outcome B	Knowledge and Skills
Outcome C	Actions to Meet Needs

Category a	Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning
Category b	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
Category c	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it
Category d	Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
Category e	Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

Expected Range of Responses for Each Outcome and Category, FFY 2022

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-1SD	+1SD
Outcome A\Category a	1.57	3.26	-1.69	4.83
Outcome B\Category a	1.39	3	-1.6	4.39
Outcome C\Category a	1.26	2.6	-1.33	3.86

Outcome\Category	Mean	StDev	-2SD	+2SD
Outcome A\ Category b	24.07	9.01	6.05	42.08
Outcome A\ Category c	20.96	13.11	-5.27	47.19
Outcome A\ Category d	26.97	9.61	7.74	46.2
Outcome A\ Category e	26.43	15.4	-4.37	57.23
Outcome B\ Category b	25.63	9.71	6.21	45.04
Outcome B\ Category c	29.44	12.56	4.32	54.57
Outcome B\ Category d	31.02	8.11	14.8	47.25
Outcome B\ Category e	12.51	8.23	-3.96	28.98
Outcome C\ Category b	20.98	8.89	3.19	38.76
Outcome C\ Category c	23.49	13.59	-3.68	50.66
Outcome C\ Category d	33.36	8.28	16.8	49.93
Outcome C\ Category e	20.91	15.22	-9.53	51.35

Data Anomalies Score	Total Points Received in All Progress Areas
0	0 through 9 points
1	10 through 12 points
2	13 through 15 points

Anomalies in Your State's Outcomes Data FFY 2022

Number of Infants and Toddlers with IFSP's Assessed in your State	3,398
---	-------

Outcome A — Positive Social Relationships	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	13	1,193	564	734	843
Performance (%)	0.39%	35.64%	16.85%	21.93%	25.19%
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

Outcome B — Knowledge and Skills	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	12	1,233	762	903	437
Performance (%)	0.36%	36.84%	22.77%	26.98%	13.06%
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

Outcome C — Actions to Meet Needs	Category a	Category b	Category c	Category d	Category e
State Performance	18	1,155	576	900	698
Performance (%)	0.54%	34.51%	17.21%	26.89%	20.85%
Scores	1	1	1	1	1

	Total Score
Outcome A	5
Outcome B	5
Outcome C	5
Outcomes A-C	15

Data Anomalies Score	2
----------------------	---

Appendix C

II. (a) Data Comparison:

Comparing Your State's 2022 Outcomes Data to Other States' 2022 Outcome Data

This score represents how your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2022 Outcomes Data. Your State received a score for the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements for your State compared to the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements in all other States. The 10th and 90th percentile for each of the 6 Summary Statements was identified and used to assign points to performance outcome data for each Summary Statement (values are based on data for States with a summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters). Each Summary Statement outcome was assigned 0, 1, or 2 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell at or below the 10th percentile, that Summary Statement was assigned 0 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell between the 10th and 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned 1 point, and if your State's Summary Statement value fell at or above the 90th percentile the Summary Statement was assigned 2 points. The points were added up across the 6 Summary Statements. A State can receive a total number of points between 0 and 12, with 0 points indicating all 6 Summary Statement values were at or below the 10th percentile and 12 points indicating all 6 Summary Statements were at or above the 90th percentile. An overall comparison Summary Statement score of 0, 1, or 2 was based on the total points awarded.

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Scoring Percentages for the 10th and 90th Percentile for Each Outcome and Summary Statement, FFY 2022

Percentiles	Outcome A SS1	Outcome A SS2	Outcome B SS1	Outcome B SS2	Outcome C SS1	Outcome C SS2
10	45.63%	35.29%	54.05%	27.07%	51.93%	33.56%
90	82.58%	69.37%	81.10%	56.55%	85.30%	71.29%

Data Comparison Score	Total Points Received Across SS1 and SS2
0	0 through 4 points
1	5 through 8 points
2	9 through 12 points

Your State's Summary Statement Performance FFY 2022

Summary Statement (SS)	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1	Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1	Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS1	Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS2
Performance (%)	51.84%	47.12%	57.22%	40.04%	55.72%	47.74%
Points	1	1	1	1	1	1

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2(*)	6
------------------------------------	---

Your State's Data Comparison Score	1
------------------------------------	---

Appendix D

II. (b) Performance Change Over Time:

Comparing your State's FFY 2022 data to your State's FFY 2021 data

The Summary Statement percentages in each Outcomes Area from the previous year's reporting (FFY 2021) is compared to the current year (FFY 2022) using the test of proportional difference to determine whether there is a statistically significant (or meaningful) growth or decline in child achievement based upon a significance level of $p \leq .05$. The data in each Outcome Area is assigned a value of 0 if there was a statistically significant decrease from one year to the next, a value of 1 if there was no significant change, and a value of 2 if there was a statistically significant increase across the years. The scores from all 6 Outcome Areas are totaled, resulting in a score from 0 – 12. The Overall Performance Change Score for this results element of '0', '1', or '2' for each State is based on the total points awarded. Where OSEP has approved a State's reestablishment of its Indicator C3 Outcome Area baseline data the State received a score of 'N/A' for this element.

Test of Proportional Difference Calculation Overview

The summary statement percentages from the previous year's reporting were compared to the current year using an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon a significance level of $p \leq .05$. The statistical test has several steps. All values are shown as rounded for display purposes.

Step 1: Compute the difference between the FFY 2022 and FFY 2021 summary statements.

e.g., $C3A \text{ FFY}2022\% - C3A \text{ FFY}2021\% = \text{Difference in proportions}$

Step 2: Compute the standard error of the difference in proportions using the following formula which takes into account the value of the summary statement from both years and the number of children that the summary statement is based on

$\text{Sqrt}([(FFY2021\% * (1-FFY2021\%)) / FFY2021N] + [(FFY2022\% * (1-FFY2022\%)) / FFY2022N]) = \text{Standard Error of Difference in Proportions}$

Step 3: The difference in proportions is then divided by the standard error of the difference to compute a z score.

$\text{Difference in proportions} / \text{standard error of the difference in proportions} = z \text{ score}$

Step 4: The statistical significance of the z score is located within a table and the p value is determined.

Step 5: The difference in proportions is coded as statistically significant if the p value is it is less than or equal to .05.

Step 6: Information about the statistical significance of the change and the direction of the change are combined to arrive at a score for the summary statement using the following criteria

0 = statistically significant decrease from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022

1 = No statistically significant change

2= statistically significant increase from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022

Step 7: The score for each summary statement and outcome is summed to create a total score with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 12. The score for the test of proportional difference is assigned a score for the Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score based on the following cut points:

Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score	Cut Points for Change Over Time in Summary Statements Total Score
0	Lowest score through 3
1	4 through 7
2	8 through highest

Summary Statement/ Child Outcome	FFY 2021 N	FFY 2021 Summary Statement (%)	FFY 2022 N	FFY 2022 Summary Statement (%)	Difference between Percentages (%)	Std Error	z value	p-value	p<=.05	Score: 0 = significant decrease; 1 = no significant change; 2 = significant increase
SS1/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	2,163	49.88%	2,504	51.84%	1.95	0.0147	1.3308	0.1833	NO	1
SS1/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	2,486	55.79%	2,910	57.22%	1.42	0.0135	1.0517	0.2929	NO	1
SS1/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	2,289	56.27%	2,649	55.72%	-0.55	0.0142	-0.3883	0.6978	NO	1
SS2/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships	2,912	47.49%	3,347	47.12%	-0.38	0.0127	-0.2974	0.7661	NO	1
SS2/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills	2,912	40.52%	3,347	40.04%	-0.49	0.0124	-0.3911	0.6957	NO	1
SS2/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs	2,912	48.90%	3,347	47.74%	-1.16	0.0127	-0.9136	0.3609	NO	1

Total Points Across SS1 and SS2	6
---------------------------------	---

Your State's Performance Change Score	1
---------------------------------------	---

Data Rubric
Minnesota

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part C Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3	1	1
4	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8A	1	1
8B	1	1
8C	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1

APR Score Calculation

Subtotal	13
Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	18

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/Settings Due Date: 8/30/23	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23	1	1	1	3

618 Score Calculation

Subtotal	9
Grand Total (Subtotal X 2) =	18.00

Indicator Calculation

A. APR Grand Total	18
B. 618 Grand Total	18.00
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	36.00
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
Denominator	36.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) =	1.0000
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	100.00

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 2 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 2.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) **Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part C 618 Data

1) **Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits counts/ responses for an entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part C Child Count and Setting	Part C Child Count and Settings in EMAPS	8/30/2023
Part C Exiting	Part C Exiting Collection in EMAPS	2/21/2024
Part C Dispute Resolution	Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	11/15/2023

2) **Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all data elements, subtotals, totals as well as responses to all questions associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) **Passed Edit Check** – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection. See the EMAPS User Guide for each of the Part C 618 Data Collections for a list of edit checks (available at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html>).

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part C

Minnesota

Year 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.	1
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued.	1
(1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance.	1
(1.1) (b) Reports within timelines.	1
(1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines.	0
(1.2) Complaints pending.	0
(1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.	0
(1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.	0

Section B: Mediation Requests

(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.	0
(2.1) Mediations held.	0
(2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) Mediations held no related to due process complaints.	0
(2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.	0
(2.2) Mediations pending.	0
(2.3) Mediations not held.	0

Section C: Due Process Complaints

(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.	0
Has your state adopted Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(1) or Part B due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(2)?	PARTB
(3.1) Resolution meetings (applicable ONLY for states using Part B due process hearing procedures).	0
(3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.	0
(3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.	0
(3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline.	0
(3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline.	0
(3.3) Hearings pending.	0
(3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing).	0

State Comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:
Minnesota

These data were extracted on the close date:
11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



United States Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Final Determination Letter

June 18, 2024

Honorable Willie Jett
Commissioner of Education
Minnesota Department of Education
400 NE Stinson Boulevard
Minneapolis, MN 55413

Dear Commissioner Jett :

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that Minnesota needs assistance in meeting the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of Minnesota's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

Minnesota's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in Minnesota's "2024 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for Minnesota and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix (including Components and Appendices) that include scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) Minnesota's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "How the Department Made Determinations under Sections 616(d) and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part C" (HTDMD-C).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making the Department's determinations in 2024, as it did for Part C determinations in 2015-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD-C document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for Minnesota.) For 2024, the Department's IDEA Part C determinations continue to include consideration of each State's Child Outcomes data, which measure how children who receive Part C services are improving functioning in three outcome areas that are critical to school readiness:

- positive social-emotional skills;
- acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Specifically, the Department considered the data quality and the child performance levels in each State's Child Outcomes FFY 2022 data.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of Minnesota's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your State-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access Minnesota's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in Indicators 1 through 11, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that Minnesota is required to take. The actions that Minnesota is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for your State to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

Your State will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) Minnesota's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);
- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part C," which shows how OSEP calculated the State's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the State's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, Minnesota's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above, but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's last three IDEA Part C grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



United States Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

Minnesota's determination for 2023 was also Needs Assistance. In accordance with Section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. §303.704(a), if a State is determined to need assistance for two consecutive years, the Secretary must take one or more of the following actions:

- (1) advise the State of available sources of technical assistance that may help the State address the areas in which the State needs assistance and require the State to work with appropriate entities; and/or
- (2) identify the State as a high-risk grantee and impose Specific Conditions on the State's IDEA Part C grant award.

Pursuant to these requirements, the Secretary is advising Minnesota of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and resources at the following websites: [Monitoring and State Improvement Planning \(MSIP\)](#) | [OSEP Ideas That Work](#), [Individuals with Disabilities Education Act \(IDEA\) Topic Areas](#), and requiring Minnesota to work with appropriate entities. In addition, Minnesota should consider accessing technical assistance from other Department-funded centers such as the Comprehensive Centers with resources at the following link: <https://compcenternetwork.org/states>. The Secretary directs Minnesota to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. We strongly encourage Minnesota to access technical assistance related to those results elements and compliance indicators for which Minnesota received a score of zero. Minnesota must report with its FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2025, on:

- (1) the technical assistance sources from which Minnesota received assistance; and
- (2) the actions Minnesota took as a result of that technical assistance.

As required by IDEA Sections 616(e)(7) and 642 and 34 C.F.R. §303.706, Minnesota must notify the public that the Secretary of Education has taken the above enforcement action, including, at a minimum, by posting a public notice on its website and distributing the notice to the media and to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering two additional criteria related to IDEA Part C determinations. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State that would otherwise receive a score of meets requirements would not be able to receive a determination of meets requirements if the State had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is reviewing whether and how to consider IDEA Part C results data reported under three indicators in order to improve results for all infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities. This review would include considering alternative scoring options for child outcome Indicator C-3 and considering as potential additional factors the information and data that States report under child find Indicators C-5 and C-6.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part C data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part C Results Matrix and States will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part C data that States submit will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part C SPP/APR Indicators 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part C data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the appropriate EDFacts system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part C data.

As a reminder, Minnesota must report annually to the public, by posting on the State lead agency's website, on the performance of each early intervention service (EIS) program located in Minnesota on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after Minnesota's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, Minnesota must:

- (1) review EIS program performance against targets in Minnesota's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each EIS program "meets the requirements" of Part C, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part C of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each EIS program of its determination.

Further, Minnesota must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the State lead agency's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes Minnesota's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



United States Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services

OSEP appreciates Minnesota's efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and looks forward to working with Minnesota over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams

Director

Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Part C Coordinator

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.